

In the eastern Federal judicial district of Kentucky there has been a vacancy for 9 months. I suppose it is no secret that Mr. Stanley Reed, who was the general counsel of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, was agreed upon and recommended last August for this position, with the understanding that he would remain with the R. F. C. until the first of the year.

In the meantime, at the invitation of the Attorney General, he was asked to participate in the gold cases pending before the Supreme Court. About the time they were disposed of or soon after that a vacancy occurred in the office of the Solicitor General. The Attorney General and the President persuaded Mr. Reed to accept appointment to that office, which he has done. He has been confirmed and was sworn in yesterday in his new position.

This made it necessary to select someone else for the Federal judgeship. That selection was made a few days ago, the nomination was sent to the Senate, and today the Judiciary Committee reported the nomination of Judge Hiram Church Ford, of Georgetown, who is one of the outstanding State judges of Kentucky, to fill this vacancy.

For 9 months there has been no court held in that district. Men are in jail and cases have piled up because of the delay. The next important term of court will begin in Covington next Monday. It is extremely important that Judge Ford be confirmed, the commission issued, and that he take the oath of office in time to hold court next Monday in Covington.

For that reason I had intended to ask that the nomination be confirmed today and that the President be notified, because otherwise Judge Ford cannot qualify in time to hold court as I have indicated. There has been no regular term of that court held in 9 months.

I appeal to the Senator from Vermont in the circumstances that the request be granted.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, this is the appointment of a United States district judge, I understand.

Mr. BARKLEY. That is right.

Mr. AUSTIN. The nomination is not even on the calendar.

Mr. BARKLEY. It is not on the calendar because it was just reported today.

Mr. AUSTIN. Under the rule, it must go over anyway, must it not?

Mr. BARKLEY. It would have to go over except by unanimous consent.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, I feel it my duty, regardless of what the Senator has said—

Mr. BARKLEY. Let me say what I omitted to say, that I have conferred with the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. NORRIS], who is a member of the Judiciary Committee, and I have conferred with the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY] and described the situation to both of those Senators as I have described it here. Both of them agreed not to object.

Mr. AUSTIN. I feel constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The calendar is in order.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask unanimous consent that nominations of postmasters may be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, nominations of postmasters are confirmed en bloc. That completes the calendar.

RECESS

Mr. HARRISON. As in legislative session, I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the Senate, in legislative session, took a recess until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 27, 1935, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate March 26 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

UNITED STATES EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION COMMISSION

John M. Morin to be a member of the United States Employees' Compensation Commission.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

Leo F. Walton, Lafayette.

CALIFORNIA

Robert E. O'Connell, Jr., Redwood City.

MISSOURI

David Fitzwater, Creve Coeur.

L. Dorsey Mitchell, La Grange.

Tom C. Short, Mountain Grove.

Merlin L. Grannemann, New Haven.

Grover C. Young, Niangua.

NEW JERSEY

William H. Fisher, Phillipsburg.

NORTH CAROLINA

Savannah B. Smoak, Wilkesboro.

OREGON

Sylvester D. Goshert, Nyssa.

RHODE ISLAND

Laura Francois, Alton.

George W. Jenckes, Slatersville.

Grace S. Croome, West Kingston.

TEXAS

Jasper N. Fallis, Clifton.

WISCONSIN

William J. Sullivan, Campbellsport.

Confirmation omitted from the Record of March 23 (legislative day of Mar. 13), 1935

POSTMASTER

CONNECTICUT

Inez V. Lawson, Wilton.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, MARCH 26, 1935

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rabbi Sidney S. Tedesche, Ph. D., of the Union Temple of Brooklyn, N. Y., offered the following prayer:

God of our fathers, great Architect of the Universe, who ordainest all Thy measures with a plan, though Thy purposes are past our finding, we pray that Thou mayest be with us this day.

Thou didst say unto men, in the early age of faith, "Not by might and not by power, but by My spirit." Mayest Thou again bring home unto us this truth from the revelations of history: Not by numbers of armed men, nor the material mass of men's wealth, but by the spirit of the Lord can nations prevail.

Implant that spirit within us, our Father, and give us an understanding of justice and equity so that, consecrated to high endeavor, we may be enabled to serve Thee and to serve our fellow men in Thy name.

May the words of our mouth and the meditations of our heart be acceptable in Thy sight, O Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Horne, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5913) entitled "An act making appropriations for the mili-

tary and nonmilitary activities of the War Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1936, and for other purposes."

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Mississippi makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and ninety-three Members present, not a quorum.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were closed, the Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 35]

Adair	Doutrich	Kahn	Peyser
Allen	Dunn, Miss.	Kennedy, Md.	Rayburn
Andrews, N. Y.	Dunn, Pa.	Kleberg	Robison, Ky.
Arends	Englebright	Kvale	Rogers, Okla.
Bacon	Farley	Lamneck	Schaefer
Bankhead	Ferguson	Lea, Calif.	Seger
Bolton	Gambrill	Lesinski	Shannon
Casey	Granfield	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Chapman	Greenwood	McKeough	Snell
Clark, Idaho	Griswold	McLean	Stewart
Clark, N. C.	Hartley	McLeod	Tobey
Crosby	Healey	Meeks	Treadway
Crowther	Hess	Mott	Truax
Daly	Hobbs	Norton	Underwood
Dickstein	Hollister	Patton	Wood
Disney	Johnson, W. Va.	Pettengill	

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and sixty-eight Members have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move to dispense with further proceedings under the call.

The motion was agreed to.

The doors were opened.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I renew my request to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a short bill I introduced yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

IMMIGRATION RESTRICTION AND ALIEN DEPORTATION

Mr. GREEN. Today that great fraternal and patriotic order known as the "Elks" presented to the Presiding Officers of the House and Senate, on the front steps of the Capitol, long petitions in favor of the exclusion and deportation of alien enemies of our Government. For many months the members of this great organization have been waging a vigorous campaign of education, thus arousing sentiment in favor of legislation that would better protect us from such alien enemies within our gates. On yesterday I introduced a bill, H. R. 7079, that would accomplish this end. It is an immigration-restriction and alien-deportation bill, along the line of bills I previously introduced when on the Immigration Committee and along the lines of bills introduced by my good friend and coworker, Congressman Dries, of Texas, with whom I served and cooperated when a member of the House Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

The bill, H. R. 7079, differs from his bills in that it would not allow an alien member of an organization that is plotting and planning the overthrow of our Government by force and violence and the assassination of public officials to avoid deportation by pleading fear and duress, would expressly require aliens admitted for permanent residence to apply for naturalization and to assume the duties and responsibilities of citizenship within the statutory naturalization period of 5 years or be deported; and would require the reporting annually to Congress of all stayed or suspended alien deportations, with all the facts and reasons therefor, as well as all petitions, recommendations, and protests in connection therewith, to the end that if Congress did not promptly affirmatively approve such delayed deportations the aliens should be forthwith deported as the existing law directs.

H. R. 7079 contains all of the strengthening amendments recommended by the Department of Labor and the Commissioner of Immigration, and more, and would take care of all meritorious hardship-deportation cases by directing the Secretary of Labor to report them annually to Congress for action. It does not contain the suggested discretions to deport or not deport alien criminals as the Secretary of Labor "finds in the public interest" and would repeal the discretion given the Secretary in the naturalization law passed in 1932 as a result of which last year there were readmitted deported anarchists like Emma Goldman, who went about the country giving out interviews and abusing our hospitality, as Strachey has been doing, by declaring she was "more of an anarchist than ever before." We have quite enough radicals of our own and of second-generation foreign stock without importing any more or tolerating any such display of bad taste and breach of hospitality as Emma Goldman, John Strachey, Willie Musenberg, Henry Barbusse, and other notorious anarchists, or direct-action Communists, have been exhibiting.

H. R. 7079 would not only deport habitual aliens, habitual alien criminals, enemies of our Government, dope peddlers, alien smugglers, aliens carrying machine and sawed-off shotguns, as practically all racketeers and gangsters do, but it would further restrict immigration by reducing existing European quotas 75 percent and applying the quota system of restrictions to countries of this hemisphere, reserving 75 percent of those quotas for the very near relatives, such as aged parents and the like, of naturalized-foreign-born and foreign-born residents lawfully in the United States able to support them.

Last year over 163,000 aliens legally entered the United States—an increase of about 9 percent over the previous year—and undoubtedly there were almost as many, if not more, aliens that entered illegally, because the Immigration Service reports a 50-percent increase in alien stow-aways, deserting seamen, and the like over the previous year, and that alien smuggling is on the increase—boats, automobiles, and even a number of airplanes being apprehended smuggling aliens into our country. A current release of the Department of State on the immigration work of the Department calls attention to the startling facts that our consular offices report a waiting list of over a quarter million and that there are in 47 of the 68 European quota countries alone 992,160 aliens desirous of coming to the United States.

During the past 10 years of quota restriction on European immigration over 3,000,000 aliens have entered the United States, and the last census reveals the largest number of foreign born, over 14 millions; the largest foreign stock population, over 40 millions; and the most aliens, over 6 millions, in our whole history. What we need is an immigration holiday; and my bill's enactment would give it to us by reducing existing quotas 75 percent, reserving them practically for parents and other near relatives, and extending quota restrictions to countries of this hemisphere whose immigrants are not now numerically limited and which countries absolutely exclude our nationals from entry for permanent residence or to work. We have over 10,000,000 unemployed and do not need and ought not to have admitted last year the hundreds of alien skilled and unskilled workers and job hunters that came in the 163,904 aliens the Bureau of Immigration reports legally entering our country during the fiscal year 1934. We have too many unemployed as it is without importing another one. Not only have we too many unemployed but we have too many applicants for relief, too many dependents, defectives, and delinquents without allowing another one to be imported. Each country should care for its own unemployed and dependents. Charity should begin at home. Immigration should be further restricted and practically suspended, as H. R. 7079 provides. If enacted, it will not only really restrict immigration, but it will deport the three or four million aliens illegally and unlawfully in the country, and by so doing go a long way toward solving our unemployment and relief problems, because the bill expressly provides that all aliens must get naturalized forthwith or get out, and aliens illegally here cannot produce

the necessary certificate of legal entry absolutely necessary for naturalization.

H. R. 7079 is as follows:

A bill to authorize the prompt deportation of habitual criminals and habitual aliens, to guard against the separation from their families of certain law-abiding aliens, to deport direct-action Communists, to further restrict immigration into the United States, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That an alien who entered the United States either from a foreign territory or an insular possession, either before or after the passage of this act, shall be promptly deported in the manner provided in sections 19 and 20 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, 890; U. S. C., title 8, secs. 155, 156), as amended, regardless of when he entered, if he

(1) At any time after entry is convicted of an offense, which may be punished by imprisonment for a term of 1 year or more, or of a crime involving moral turpitude, the said deportation to be made by the Secretary of Labor forthwith at the time he is released from confinement, or is placed upon probation, or is pardoned; or

(2) Has been convicted of possessing or carrying any concealed or dangerous weapons; or

(3) Knowingly possesses or carries any weapon which shoots or is designed to shoot, automatically or semiautomatically, more than one shot without manual reloading, by a single function or trigger; or

(4) Has been convicted of violation of a State narcotic law; or

(5) Knowingly encouraged, induced, assisted, abetted, or aided anyone to enter or try to enter the United States in violation of law; or

(6) Does not within 1 year after the enactment of this act, or if he enters thereafter does not within 1 year after entry, declare his intention to become a citizen of the United States and fails to use due diligence and to become within the 5 years' statutory naturalization period a citizen of the United States: *Provided*, That this particular provision shall not apply to nonimmigrant aliens admitted temporarily under section 3 and to nonquota immigrant aliens admitted temporarily under section 4 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924, so long as the said nonimmigrant and nonquota immigrant aliens maintain the temporary admission status under which they were admitted; or

(7) Is a member of or affiliated with any organization which, or who believes in, advises, advocates, or teaches the overthrow by force or violence of the Government of the United States, or the duty, necessity, or propriety of the unlawful assaulting or killing of any officer or officers (either specific individuals or officers generally) of the Government of the United States or of any other organized government, because of his or their official character, of the unlawful damage, injury, or destruction of property, or sabotage, or a doctrine which advocates the overthrow by force or violence of governments, constituted authority, or social order, existing in countries not under the control of Communists and the establishment in place thereof a regime termed "proletarian dictatorship" or a system based upon common ownership of property and abolition of private property, provided that the platform, program, or objectives of the Third Internationale or Communist International shall be held to embrace the said doctrine.

SEC. 2. That from and after July 1, 1935, the quota in the case of any nationality for which a quota has been determined and proclaimed under the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended, shall be 25 percent of such quota, but the minimum quota of any nationality shall be 100. From and after July 1, 1935, no immigration visas shall be issued under subdivision (c) of section 4 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 204), but all the provisions of the immigration laws shall be applicable to immigrants born in any of the geographical areas specified in such subdivision as if each of such areas had at that time a quota equal to 25 percent (but not less than 100) of the number of nonquota immigration visas issued, during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1930, to immigrants born in such area: *Provided, however*, That reciprocal arrangements may be entered into by the Department of State and the Department of Labor with the Dominion of Canada, Newfoundland, and Mexico whereby as many immigrants born in the respective foreign contiguous territories to continental United States are admitted to the United States annually as persons born in the United States are annually admitted into those respective countries. Section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended (U. S. C., supp. VI, title 8, sec. 206), is amended to read as follows:

"(A) Immigration visas as to quota immigrants shall be issued in each fiscal year as follows: (1) 75 percent of each nationality for such year shall be made available in each year for the issuance of immigration visas to the following classes of immigrants: (a) Quota immigrants who are the fathers or the mothers or the husbands by marriage occurring after January 1, 1933, of citizens of the United States who are 21 years of age or over; and (b) quota immigrants who are unmarried children under 21 years of age, or the wives, or husbands, or the mother, or the father, of alien residents of the United States who were lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence.

"(2) Any portion of the quota of each nationality for such year not required for the issuance of immigration visas to the classes specified in paragraph 1 shall be made available in such year for the issuance of immigration visas to other quota immigrants of such nationality.

"(B) The preference provided in paragraphs 1 and 2 of subdivision (a) shall, in the case of quota immigrants of any na-

tionality, be given in the calendar month in which the right of preference is established, if the number of immigration visas which may be issued in any such month to quota immigrants of such nationality has not already been issued; otherwise in the next calendar month."

SEC. 3. That if any alien has been arrested and deported in pursuance of law, he shall be excluded from admission to the United States whether such deportation took place before or after the enactment of this act, and if he enters or attempts to enter the United States after the enactment of this act he shall be guilty of felony and upon conviction thereof shall, unless a different penalty is otherwise provided by law, be punished by imprisonment for not more than 2 years or by a fine of not more than \$1,000, or by both such fine and imprisonment: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to any alien who has, prior to its enactment, obtained the lawful permission of the Secretary of Labor to reenter the United States and has reentered or who arrives in the United States with such permission within 60 days after this act becomes effective. For the purposes of this section any alien ordered deported (whether before or after the enactment of this act), who has left the United States, shall be considered to have been deported in pursuance of law, irrespective of the source from which the expenses of his transportation were defrayed or of the place to which deported. Section 7 of the act entitled "An act to further amend the naturalization laws, and for other purposes", approved May 25, 1932, is hereby repealed.

SEC. 4. The Secretary of Labor may suspend for not more than 1 year the order or warrant of deportation of any alien of good moral character, subject to deportation under the provisions of section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 155), and section 14 of the Immigration Act of May 26, 1924 (43 Stat. 162; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 214), only, provided such alien has been in the United States 10 years, or has an American citizen wife, husband, child, or aged, dependent parent, and is in sympathy with our form of government, and has declared his intention to become a citizen of the United States. As to each such said suspension, the said Secretary shall forthwith report to the Congress, if in session, or if not in session, then the first day after Congress is in session, all the facts and reasons for such suspended order or warrant of deportation, and all recommendations, petitions, appeals, protests, and the like, in connection therewith; and the Secretary of Labor shall at the end of 6 months, or upon the adjournment of Congress, whichever is sooner, after such report is made to the Congress, unless Congress shall have by law or resolution directed otherwise, execute and carry out such order or warrant of deportation. If Congress should direct the cancellation of said order or warrant of deportation the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization may accept any head tax therefor due and unpaid, may amend nunc pro tunc the entry record of the alien so as to establish lawful admission for permanent residence, and may issue, upon the receipt of the fee required therefor by law, a certificate of arrival.

SEC. 5. The Secretary of Labor may specifically designate persons holding supervisory positions in the Immigration and Naturalization Service to issue warrants for the arrest of aliens believed to be subject to deportation under this or any other statute: *Provided*, That no person shall act under a warrant issued by himself.

SEC. 6. The first sentence in section 21 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 874), entitled "An act regulating the immigration of aliens to, and residence of aliens in, the United States, and for other purposes", is hereby amended, effective as of the date of this act, to read as follows:

"SEC. 21. That any arriving alien, who has already obtained an immigration visa in accordance with the provisions of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 153), as amended, liable to be excluded because likely to become a public charge or because of physical disability other than tuberculosis in any form or a loathsome or dangerous contagious disease may, if otherwise admissible, nevertheless be admitted upon the giving of a suitable and proper bond or undertaking approved by the Secretary of Labor, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, to the United States and to all States, Territories, counties, cities, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof, holding the United States and all States, Territories, counties, cities, towns, municipalities, and districts thereof harmless against such alien becoming a public charge."

SEC. 7. Any employee of the Immigration and Naturalization Service shall have power to detain for investigation any alien whom he has reason to believe is subject to deportation under this or any other act. Any alien so detained shall be immediately brought before an immigrant inspector designated for that purpose by the Secretary of Labor and shall not be held in custody for more than 24 hours thereafter unless prior to the expiration of that time a warrant for his arrest is issued.

SEC. 8. The Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, with the approval of the Secretary of Labor, shall prescribe rules and regulations for the enforcement of the provisions of this act.

SEC. 9. The foregoing provisions of this act with the exception of parts of sections 2 and 3 and all of section 8, are in addition to and not in substitution for the provisions of the immigration laws, including section 19 of the Immigration Act of February 5, 1917 (39 Stat. 889, U. S. C., title 8, sec. 155), and shall be enforced as part of such laws.

SEC. 10. Clause (B) of paragraph (1) of subsection (a) of section 6 of the Immigration Act of 1924 (43 Stat. 155), as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 206 (a)), which grants to quota immigrants skilled in agriculture, their wives, and their dependent children under the age of 18 years, a preference within the quota, is repealed.

THE SOUTH AND THE NEW DEAL

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made by my colleague, Mr. FISH, of New York, on the operation of the new deal in the South.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, under leave granted me to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following speech of Representative HAMILTON FISH, Jr., of New York, over the Columbia Broadcasting System, including the Dixie network, Tuesday evening, March 26, 1935:

I am grateful to the Columbia Broadcasting System for the opportunity to speak over the Dixie network and to reach 23 radio stations in the South. I hope my invisible audience, many of whom may not agree with my political views, will stay on the radio and listen to a presentation of the facts, disagreeable though they may be, affecting their own interests and livelihood.

At any rate, if ruin and disaster smites the cotton and textile industries of the South hip and thigh, don't try to place the blame on the Republicans or say that they failed to warn you that you were following unsound and disastrous economic policies leading to inevitable ruin. At least forewarned is to be forearmed.

As for me, I am a militant and unrepentant Republican of the school of Thomas Jefferson, Abraham Lincoln, and Theodore Roosevelt and have represented the congressional district in which the President lives for the past 15 years and am a member of the Farm Bureau Federation and the National Grange. I believe in placing my country's welfare above that of my party, and I recognize that the welfare of the Southland and the financial interests of the cotton and textile States and the employment of its people are not local or sectional problems but national issues, affecting the economic well-being of all the American people and the stability of our country.

Recovery under the new deal is a myth and a mirage, backed by propaganda over the radio and billions of dollars out of the Treasury. The failure of the new-deal measures was inevitable, because they were economically unsound, unworkable, and a form of imported state socialism that does not thrive in America. The southern cotton States received a temporary benefit through the Federal Government's attempts to peg cotton prices at 12 cents by use of loans. But the temporary benefits from the unsound new-deal measures have emanated from the "brain trust" pied pipers, Secretary of Agriculture Henry A. Wallace and Under Secretary Rexford Guy Tugwell, who are leading the cotton planters on to their financial and economic destruction, and the South along with them. The 25-percent reduction of cotton crops under the dictation of the A. A. A. has increased unemployment in the South and has already brought ruin and misery to the tenant farmers and share-croppers.

The rapidly vanishing foreign markets for our cotton surplus is a direct menace to the well-being and economic interests of all southern cotton States. The situation is far too serious to ignore any longer, and is attributable to the socialistic new-deal policies, which bring havoc and ruin wherever these "brain trust" experiments are tried out. What does it profit the cotton States to have temporary artificial increases in the price of cotton by the manipulations of the A. A. A. and wake up to find that our foreign markets have been lost? Last year our cotton exports declined over 2,000,000 bales, and it is much worse this season. Already our cotton exports have fallen off under 2 years of the new-deal experiments by 50 percent. The Lord only knows what will happen in the next 2 years if these mirages are still pursued.

Encouraged by the 25-percent reduction of cotton and the 12-cent price in the United States, Egypt, Brazil, Soviet Russia, India, China, and North Africa have increased their production by 3,000,000 bales, and are rapidly taking away the world markets from us, which once lost will be difficult to regain. No wonder thoughtful business men in the South are beginning to turn against the new deal when they see ruin staring them in the face.

Increased unemployment, impoverished tenant farmers, more on the relief rolls, and a huge financial and economic loss annually is what the South is facing as the cotton export trade steadily decreases.

The United States exported in normal years approximately 8,000,000 bales of cotton. These exports have declined by more than half, and the tragedy of the situation is that they are dwindling away while the "new dealers" fiddle and zig zag from right to left, but never in any sound direction. The Tugwells and the Ezekiels and the other "brain trusters" are engaged in a dance of death with the cotton planters to the detriment of the South. There is less cotton being exported than at any time since the Civil War, and as a result of the loss of our cotton exports hundreds of thousands of clerks and other employees engaged in ginning, compressing, transporting, shipping, and in warehouses and mills have lost their jobs. Whereas the A. A. A. program of reduction of the cotton crops may help some cotton farmers there are millions of people in the South directly and indirectly adversely affected, as are all consumers.

The southern shipping ports of Charleston, Savannah, Norfolk, Mobile, New Orleans, Memphis, and Galveston are all suffering from the rapid decline in our cotton exports, thanks to the plow-

ing under of crops by the A. A. A. The economy of scarcity and restriction is reaping its own whirlwind of disastrous consequences and evil fruits through importation of shiploads of grain and meat from South America, butter from New Zealand, and cheese from Denmark. I was advised by the Department of Agriculture this morning that since last July 10,000,000 bushels of oats have been imported to compete with the oats produced in the South and Southwest; 8,000,000 bushels of barley, and 7,000,000 bushels of corn, and 6,000,000 bushels of rye. In addition 16,000,000 bushels of wheat have been imported, whereas we have only exported 3,000,000 bushels and the equivalent of 12,000,000 in flour, leaving the United States, unbelievable as it may sound, a net importer of wheat, with the duty at 42 cents—a crop like cotton, which has been reduced by Government regulations.

I am opposed to the governmental policy of restriction and scarcity, when there are 12,000,000 unemployed Americans and 23,000,000 on the relief rolls. If the Government is right, that a policy of producing less makes for wealth and prosperity, then it must follow that producing next to nothing would make us fabulously wealthy. The wand wavers, and magic performers at Washington, in addition to undermining and destroying the principles of Jeffersonian Democracy, will by their costly blunders and crazy-quilt experiments, if continued for 2 more years, ruin and wreck the economic stability of the South more than anything that has happened since the Civil War.

The Republican Party should come out openly and boldly for a square deal for the farmers within the compass of the Constitution, and for an equilibrium of prices between the products of the farms, factories, and mines, which is impossible under the N. R. A. The farmers are entitled to the cost of production plus a reasonable profit, and to the preservation of both the domestic and foreign markets through sound and fair policies and not through lowering or destroying the standards of living and wages of the American people.

In the limited time at my disposal let me discuss briefly another phase of the cotton situation. The textile mills of North and South Carolina, Virginia, Tennessee, Georgia, and Alabama are all being seriously handicapped from the competition of Japanese cotton goods in the Philippines, Colombia, Cuba, Haiti, and Central America. The actual Japanese importations of cotton goods into the United States is taking on alarming proportions and will force the cotton mills of both the North and South to shut down and thereby increase the ranks of the unemployed.

I charge the administration, through the visionary free-trade policies of Secretary of State Hull, with being responsible for helping to wreck and destroy the textile industry of the South, one of its greatest sources of wealth and employment. Already the gross stupidities and blunders of the State Department in a visionary and totally impractical attempt to break down economic barriers throughout the world has sacrificed the textile industry, America's second largest industry, on the altar of free trade to the Japanese.

The time has come to tell the truth and place the responsibility where it belongs—on the shoulders of President Roosevelt and his free-trade Secretary of State, Cordell Hull. It must be self-evident that American labor cannot compete with skilled Japanese labor paid 20 cents a day and operating modern textile plants equipped for mass production. However, Secretary Hull, true to his free-trade principles, and long-distance policies, which will take effect after the southern mills have been destroyed and its labor ruined, is deaf, dumb, and blind to the welfare and interests of the American textile industry, which employs 400,000 industrious and loyal American citizens.

The South is vitally interested and its welfare is at stake. How long will its people continue to remain silent in face of the economic insanity of the administration? To illustrate how far this administration will carry its free-trade policy without regard to the interests of American labor, it turned down 6 months ago an offer of the Philippine Congress to grant adequate protection to American textiles as against Japanese, because it would interfere with the visionary principles and long-distance policies of the administration. Thus we have practically lost, through the inexcusable and almost traitorous action of the State Department, our single greatest export market for our textiles.

Last December Japan controlled 75 percent of the textile imports into the Philippines, and we controlled less than 25 percent, whereas 2 years ago it was just the reverse. Another 6 months of State Department blunders and our Philippine textile trade will be wiped out. What has happened in the Philippines has also taken place in Cuba, Colombia, the Dominican Republic, Haiti, and the rest of Central and South America where we exported previously most of our textile products.

However, that is not the entire story, because Japanese cotton goods are beginning to flood the American market. The following figures showing imports into the United States of Japanese cotton goods speak for themselves:

	Square yards
1933	1,116,000
1934	7,287,000
1935, in January alone.....	5,000,000

And in February one Japanese ship landed 4,000,000 square yards, and it is estimated that the total for the month will double that of January or exceed the total for 1934. Unless the shipment of Japanese goods into the United States is stopped one textile mill after another in both the North and South will be compelled to shut down, throwing American labor into the ranks of the unemployed.

The people of the South, regardless of party affiliations, do not propose to commit economic suicide for the benefit of the "new

dealers", Secretary Hull, or President Roosevelt. They do not propose to have their legitimate interests sacrificed by Secretary Hull, a free trader and an internationalist, for the benefit of Japan or any other nation.

The textile industry must be afforded adequate protection at home, and both our cotton and textile exports must be given preferences in the bargaining or reciprocal-trade treaties now being negotiated with foreign nations, which, sad to relate, is not being done.

In order to pursue fantastic mirages and nebulous experiments our free-trade crystal-gazers in the State Department have ignored the interests of both the cotton and textile industries, and have thrown them into the limbo of forgotten things to the detriment of free American labor and for the benefit and employment of labor in foreign lands.

The processing taxes imposed by the new-deal administration—I will not honor them with the name Democratic—is nothing but a tariff within the United States, hitherto a free-trade country, within its own boundaries on the necessities of life, and a means of increasing the cost of living for the American people. Shades of John C. Calhoun! To think of his party erecting tariff barriers within the United States against its own people, and refusing to raise a finger to protect our domestic and foreign markets against cheap foreign labor for both our cotton and textile industries employing more American wage earners than any other two of our industries.

There is no party today to speak for Jeffersonian principles except a liberalized Republican Party that will not pussyfoot and compromise with the unsound, socialistic, and destructive features of the "new deal", which affect the welfare, the interests, and the daily lives of every citizen in the Nation, and will not tolerate the weakening of our constitutional and representative form of government.

Our appeal must be made equally to Jeffersonian Democrats and Abraham Lincoln Republicans to uphold and defend the fundamental American principles of government, advocated by both Jefferson and Lincoln, steering clear of socialism, communism, Government ownership, regimentation, collectivism, destructive taxation, and a huge crushing superbureaucracy at Washington.

For well over a hundred years Jeffersonian Democrats have battled for their principles without fear or favor until the advent of this administration and its socialistic and Santa Claus policies. Jeffersonian Democrats for all these years have boldly proclaimed their political creed, which stood for the rights and liberties of the individual citizen under the Constitution, for economy, for State rights, against the centralization and concentration of power in the hands of the Federal Government and the use of such concentrated powers by the Federal Government to interfere with business or the rights and liberties of the individual. Every principle of Jeffersonian Democrats has been repudiated by the administration at Washington and trampled underfoot by the "brain trust", who are not and never have been Democrats.

There is an old story of Abraham Lincoln's that aptly illustrates what has happened in the last 2 years to the principles advocated by Jeffersonian Democrats for over a hundred and thirty-five years. Lincoln said that two men with overcoats on fought so hard that they fought into each other's overcoats. That is what has happened between the Republican and Democratic Parties. The Democratic Party has fought so hard that it has fought itself into the Republican overcoat of centralized government; but, not stopping there, has gone far, far beyond into Government ownership, regimentation, bureaucracy, collectivism, and actual State socialism.

No wonder real Democrats are asking what has happened to their political creed. The answer is that it has been repudiated by the "brain trust" and near-Socialists temporarily in command of the Democratic Party. A liberalized Republican Party stands today much nearer the principles of Jeffersonian Democrats and has a right to appeal to them to cross over a bridge built upon the firm foundation of the rights and liberties of the individual and the Constitution of the United States, in order to oust the present administration that has ignored State's rights and all but destroyed representative government, by erecting a gigantic, costly, and tyrannical bureaucracy at Washington to regiment the daily lives of 125,000,000 free Americans.

Let us build a bridge so that millions of deceived, disgruntled, and disgusted Jeffersonian Democrats may cross over to a liberalized Republican Party in 1936 and help elect a Republican President in order to oust the socialistic new-deal administration at Washington and save and preserve the principles of Thomas Jefferson from destruction by those within the Democratic Party who are now following false political leaders and doctrines, most of which are foreign to American ideals and a democratic form of government.

I have often been asked what kind of a platform the Republicans propose, and my answer to that is we could well take a large part of the last Democratic platform, especially those planks that have been thrown overboard, such as a 25-percent reduction in the running expenses of the Government, a balanced Budget, sound money to be preserved at all hazards, a reduction in the number of commissions, to stop borrowing and to stop deficits, and, in addition, a drastic modification of the N. R. A. and the A. A. A.

THE PARLIAMENTARY PROCEDURE IN CONNECTION WITH THE BONUS

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. JENKINS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, the fact that on last Thursday, March 21, the House of Representatives voted to substitute the Patman bill for the Vinson bill by a vote of 202 to 191, and that on the next day the House voted again on practically the same subject by a vote of 207 to 204 has caused much confusion in the minds of many who follow the proceedings of Congress. Believing that is of sufficient importance to justify an explanation, I arise to explain it briefly.

All bonus bills are referred to the Ways and Means Committee for consideration. This committee recommended the passage of the Vinson bill, thereby placing it on the calendar for consideration in its turn. In order to have a bill considered out of its turn it is necessary to pass a special rule. The Rules Committee offered a resolution to that effect, which was adopted. This special rule provided for the immediate consideration of the Vinson bill and that after 10 hours of debate it should be acted upon. And if Mr. PATMAN or others, who had introduced bonus bills, wished to offer their bills as substitutes for the Vinson bill they could do so. Mr. PATMAN offered his bill as a substitute on Thursday. A vote was had, and the Patman bill was substituted for the Vinson bill by a vote of 202 to 191. The House then adjourned.

The special rule also provided, as is the usual custom, that after a bill had been accepted by the House, a motion might be made to recommit that bill to the Ways and Means Committee again for consideration, with instructions. On Friday when Congress convened Mr. VINSON moved to recommit the Patman bill to the committee with instructions to report back forthwith substituting the Vinson bill for the Patman bill. A vote was had, and Congress refused to recommit, by a vote of 207 to 204. Thus the Vinson bill was defeated again. This was a very close vote. The vote would have been 204 for the Patman bill and 205 for the Vinson bill except for the fact that two Members who had declined to vote when this motion was called asked permission to vote for the Patman bill, raising that vote to 206, and except that another Member who had voted for the Vinson bill changed to the Patman bill, reducing the Vinson vote to 204 and increasing the Patman vote to 207.

After the failure to substitute the Vinson bill an attempt was made to substitute the Tydings bill for the Patman bill. This lost by 319 to 82. I voted for the Patman bill.

After both motions to recommit had failed the matter then came up on its final passage. The question was whether the House would accept the Patman bill or whether it would reject any bonus bill. The Patman bill was accepted by a vote of 318 to 90. I voted for the Patman bill.

Although I preferred the Vinson plan, yet when it was defeated I voted for the Patman plan on its final passage, as I feel that the important thing is to pay the bonus.

The special rule allowed for the consideration of this matter was probably more liberal and wide open than any rule ever granted by the House for any important measure. This fact, together with the fact that the same question was voted on twice on succeeding days, and that the results were so close and were changed by last minute changes of votes, makes this contest stand out as a high light in the history of Congress from a parliamentary standpoint.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks and to include therein a bill that I have introduced and tables showing the benefits to the respective States operating under the bill if it was enacted into law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object, how long are those tables?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Short tables. I am going to explain them.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Upon what subject?

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. To authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts in the several States for the purpose of assisting and enabling them to refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, on February 27 I introduced House bill 6227, a copy of which is as follows:

A bill to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts in the several States for the purpose of assisting and enabling such counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts to reduce and refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness, and for other purposes

Be it enacted, etc., That the Congress considers the present economic condition to be in part the consequence of the issuance of a large amount of bonds on the part of counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts, bearing a high rate of interest, necessitating high tax levies annually, which has largely destroyed the true value of farms and other real estate, and has caused the sale of many homes because of the inability of the owners to pay the high taxes levied thereon, all of which has combined to impair our national economic security. It is, therefore, declared that these conditions are of national public interest and render imperative the immediate enactment of remedial legislation whereby land values will be restored, the purchasing power of our people increased, and homes saved from tax sales.

Sec. 2. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized, empowered, and directed to make loans, as hereinafter provided, in an aggregate amount of \$1,000,000,000 to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts legally existing in the several States of the United States for the purpose of assisting and enabling such counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts to reduce and refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness. The term of any such loan shall not exceed 40 years, and the rate of interest payable by any county, parish, road district, and/or school district to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for such loan shall not exceed 3 percent per annum.

Sec. 3. The word "division" when hereinafter used in this act shall mean any county and/or parish and/or road district and/or school district legally existing in the several States of the United States.

Sec. 4. The total sum of money to be available to the divisions in any one State shall be that percentage of the total amount authorized to be loaned herein as is the percentage of the total bonded indebtedness of the entire number of such divisions in that State when compared to the total bonded indebtedness of all such divisions in the United States. The total sum of money to be available to any one division shall be that percentage of the total amount available to the State in which same is situated as is the percentage of the total bonded indebtedness of the particular division compared to the total bonded indebtedness of all divisions in that State.

Sec. 5. Before any division shall be eligible to receive a loan under the terms of this act, the proper constituted authorities of the particular division making application for a loan shall contract, in the manner provided by the rules and regulations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation made in accordance with the provisions of this act, to use the money received from the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the purpose of retiring such amounts of the outstanding bonds of the district as the sum of the loan is sufficient to call in. The bonds of any division which are past due and unpaid together with those bonds that would cost the division the largest sum of money in interest charges as computed to the date of maturity shall be the first issue or issues chosen for retirement.

Sec. 6. No loan shall be made under the provisions of this act until the Reconstruction Finance Corporation has been satisfied that an agreement has been entered into between the division and the holders of its outstanding bonds whereby the division will be able to purchase or refund such bonds at a price determined by the Corporation to be reasonable after taking into consideration the average market price of such bonds over the 6 months' period ending January 1, 1935, but this provision shall not apply to divisions having legal option under the laws of its State to recall its outstanding bonds at will when the division desires to exercise such option.

Sec. 7. Upon the approval of any loan to any division such division shall issue and deliver its refunding bond or bonds to the Reconstruction Finance Corporation for the amount of said loan and shall also agree not to issue any other bonds while said refunding bond or bonds or any part thereof are outstanding unless with the consent and approval of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

Sec. 8. When any division shall begin repaying the money loaned to it by the Reconstruction Finance Corporation under the provisions of this act, together with the interest due thereon, said sums so repaid shall constitute a revolving fund to be used for additional loans to divisions in compliance with the provisions of this act: *Provided, however,* That all current interest obligations

and expenses chargeable against the Reconstruction Finance Corporation on account of this act shall first be paid out of any moneys so repaid before any additional loans shall be made.

Sec. 9. The Reconstruction Finance Corporation is hereby authorized and empowered to make such rules and regulations, employ such personnel, and do such other acts as may be necessary for the administration of the provisions of this act.

Sec. 10. The amount of notes, debentures, bonds, or other such obligations which the Reconstruction Finance Corporation is authorized and empowered to have outstanding at any one time under section 9 of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, as amended, is increased by the sum of \$1,000,000,000.

Mr. Speaker, I am prompted to make this appeal for the favorable consideration of this bill because I can appreciate the very necessary relief that its enactment would bring to the overburdened taxpayers of the counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts of the entire United States.

Every person who is aware of the problems of today knows that the high rate of taxation paid by home owners and property owners was one of the chief causes for the coming of the depression. The continuation of this evil is a big factor that enables the depression to persist in spreading economic havoc from one side of the country to the other, uniformly scattering financial distress everywhere. This is true because high county and district taxes have helped to destroy the true value of farms and other real estate, have caused the sale of homes, and have limited the income of all our citizens alike.

It is common knowledge, Mr. Speaker, that it is not Federal and State government taxation that is grinding down our citizens to the point of hopelessness. That is not the chief source of our troubles. County and district taxation that is so high as to be almost unpayable has been causing the loss of our homes and other concurrent evils. That is the situation that is in such urgent need of remedy.

The purpose of the proposed legislation is briefly, yet fully set out in the title, which declares that the bill is "to authorize the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to make loans to counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts in the several States for the purpose of assisting and enabling such counties, parishes, road districts, and school districts to reduce and refinance their outstanding bonded indebtedness."

Our voters are well acquainted with the situation prevalent in every county, in every road district, and in every school district in this country. The bonded indebtedness of each and every one of them is enormous. The interest rate paid by the taxpayers on these bonds is not only high but it is extremely excessive, being in the neighborhood of 6 percent all over the country.

On the other hand, we see the Federal Government able, because of its immense resources, to obtain funds at rates lower than 3 percent. It is unnecessary and it is wrong for the local citizen, because of the limited resources of his locality, to have to pay 6 percent interest on his bonded indebtedness, when the Federal Government, at present engaged in so many beneficent enterprises at its own expense, could remedy the situation at no expense at all. It would be necessary to do nothing but extend the funds to the localities supported by their own credit and in no way lessening or attacking the stability of the credit of the Federal Government.

If the localities under discussion had sufficient funds they could at will recall at least a large part of those bonds on which they are now paying such large sums in interest charges. The United States Government could make this money available to them at less than 3 percent. Money at 3 percent instead of 6 percent would mean an annual saving of 3 percent to the taxpayers.

The total bonded indebtedness of all the counties, road districts, and school districts in the United States is over \$6,000,000,000, as based on figures for the year 1932. Six billion dollars is such a tremendous sum that we cannot refund the entire amount, but there is no reason for not taking a very important step in the right direction and making a billion dollars available for refunding one-sixth of these obligations, and taking \$30,000,000 a year from the big bondholders and leaving it in the hands of our substantial citizens who are staggering under an unnecessary tax burden and who are

losing their homes by foreclosure and tax sales because of excessive taxation.

My bill proposes to extend the lending power of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation by \$1,000,000,000 to enable it to secure the necessary funds to be extended to the local divisions for the refunding of their bonds that now carry such heavy interest charges. The bill specifically provides that those bond issues that now carry the highest interest charges shall be the first chosen for retirement, thus making the available funds do the most good when used.

The method by which the billion dollars would be distributed is absolutely fair and impartial. There is no possibility of favoritism, because distribution will be determined on a pro rata basis. Statistical experts of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation will determine the total bonded indebtedness of all the counties, road districts, and school districts in each particular State of the Union. When that has been accomplished, the total for the entire United States will be fixed. Then each State will have allotted to its counties, road districts, and school districts such portion of the billion-dollar fund as its indebtedness compares to the total like indebtedness of the United States. This will guarantee that each State will have help according to its needs as demonstrated by its outstanding bonded indebtedness, and this will be the only standard governing the distribution of the funds. The States that most need the relief will receive such percentage of help as their needs entitle them to. There will be no question of each State's getting its share as mathematically determined by a fair rule.

The same rule that applies to distribution to States will apply to distribution to the various localities after the quota for the State has been determined, thus assuring the same fair, equitable distribution. My friends, there will not be a taxpayer in the whole United States that this bill will fail to reach, however completely forgotten he may think himself to be. Everyone will receive the same measure of relief, gaged by the need of help.

Mr. Speaker, a few critics of this legislation have declared that the credit of the United States Government is already so greatly overworked that it could not afford to take on \$1,000,000,000 in additional obligations and that it must not be put to any additional expense. There will be no expense to the Federal Government involved in this bill and the net obligations of the country as a whole will not be increased. There will be a scaling down of interest charges. Every bond issued by the Federal Government to secure funds for this proposal will be supported by a bond of similar amount from the locality receiving the benefit. The bonds issued to the Federal Government by the local divisions will be supported by the taxing power of those divisions, thereby guaranteeing their value. It will be merely an exchange of bond for bond, but the new bonds on the locality, aided by the United States, will carry a rate of 3 percent instead of 6, as formerly, and therein will be found the \$30,000,000 saving, the difference of 3 percent on an amount of \$1,000,000,000.

Today we see the United States Government borrowing billions of dollars and in turn lending it to the home owners through the agency of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and to the farmers through the Federal land banks and by seed loans. The Federal Housing Administration is engaged in guaranteeing mortgages on homes, this being done to prevent foreclosures. I approve all of this, for it is being done by the Administration as an attempt to safeguard property and the home as the basic institutions of this country. These huge sums are being loaned and have been loaned in an effort to cultivate and maintain the desire for property and a home, a desire that is common to all and which is the fundamental unit upon which civilization itself is based. All of these past efforts are good, and I am happy to endorse them so far as they go, but we must pass some legislation that will enable our people to keep their homes after the Federal Government has made these large sums available. In this connection I repeat the truism that excessive local taxation is the most dangerous existing menace to the continued and successful ownership of homes and property in this country. The principles of sound business dictate that if the Govern-

ment desires to protect the sums it has already advanced it should see that high local taxes are reduced. They will be reduced if the bill which I have introduced is enacted into a law and the Government makes the sum available that I am seeking, for the resulting \$30,000,000 saving will go a long way toward guaranteeing the success of the efforts we have put forth through the establishment and operation of the Home Owners' Loan Corporation and similar agencies. Many a home and many a piece of property will be made safe for the owner. Furthermore, it will be much easier for those who do not have a home to acquire one if the specter of unreasonable, unnecessary taxation does not haunt them every step of the way toward the realization of ownership.

What caused our people to be under the necessity of obtaining help from the Federal Government in the first place? It is beyond question that the burden of unreasonable local taxation was one of the major causes. It is folly not to remedy this situation, because failure to correct it will mean that the load on the Federal Government will become heavier and heavier instead of decreasing. The loans that have already been advanced will not be sufficiently protected. If \$1,000,000,000 were made available to the counties, road districts, and school districts at 3 percent, and they used it to retire bonds that now carry an interest rate of 6 percent and over, they would save \$30,000,000 annually while repaying the money to the Federal Treasury. The Federal Government, instead of losing anything, would be doing a great deal to protect money already advanced and would save many homes.

The Government has already made tremendous loans through the Reconstruction Finance Corporation to railroads, banks, and industries to help them carry on. If these large sums can be made available to one portion of our citizenry, certainly the taxpayers should receive some help. If the load were taken off their backs, they could help some of the enterprises that are forced to rely on the Government.

Let me remind you that this is not a temporary plan. In addition to meeting an emergency situation, the bill provides for a revolving fund to be established from the funds paid into the Treasury by the divisions when they discharge their obligations, and this money is to be used for the purpose of continuing this undertaking until lasting benefit has been brought to the American taxpayer.

Mr. Speaker, the soundness of the principle of this bill has already been approved by Congress and the President in extending aid to drainage districts. I ask that we extend the principle in the manner I have described in order that tax relief may be secured. There is no reason to prevent its being done. Courage has been the outstanding characteristic of the new deal, but no courage should be required for the passage of this bill. Its practicality cannot be questioned; its benefits are certain. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the following table will show the estimated approximate benefits that will come to the taxpayers of each State if Congress will enact H. R. 6227 into law.

Estimated approximate amounts that will be made available in each State of the Union under the operation of H. R. 6227, as taken from 1932 figures of the Census Bureau, together with estimated savings in interest charges to the taxpayers in each State where the present interest rates are 6 percent on the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the counties, road districts, and school districts

State	Amount of loan to each State	Annual saving in interest charges to each State
Alabama.....	\$7,200,000	\$216,000
Arizona.....	7,700,000	231,000
Arkansas.....	13,400,000	402,000
California.....	75,400,000	2,262,000
Colorado.....	9,900,000	297,000
Connecticut.....	9,000,000	270,000
Delaware.....	1,700,000	51,000
Florida.....	45,500,000	1,365,000
Georgia.....	8,400,000	252,000
Idaho.....	9,500,000	285,000
Illinois.....	91,100,000	2,733,000
Indiana.....	23,100,000	693,000
Iowa.....	29,200,000	876,000
Kansas.....	10,300,000	309,000
Kentucky.....	7,000,000	210,000

Estimated approximate amounts that will be made available in each State of the Union under the operation of H. R. 6227, as taken from 1932 figures of the Census Bureau, together with estimated savings in interest charges to the taxpayers in each State where the present interest rates are 6 percent on the outstanding bonded indebtedness of the counties, road districts, and school districts—Continued

State	Amount of loan to each State	Annual saving in interest charges to each State
Louisiana.....	\$30,000,000	\$900,000
Maine.....	3,400,000	102,000
Maryland.....	7,800,000	234,000
Massachusetts.....	2,200,000	66,000
Michigan.....	31,200,000	936,000
Minnesota.....	18,000,000	540,000
Mississippi.....	15,700,000	471,000
Missouri.....	17,800,000	534,000
Montana.....	7,200,000	216,000
Nebraska.....	9,000,000	270,000
Nevada.....	1,000,000	30,000
New Hampshire.....	1,900,000	57,000
New Jersey.....	60,000,000	1,800,000
New Mexico.....	1,500,000	45,000
New York.....	85,600,000	2,568,000
North Carolina.....	31,900,000	957,000
North Dakota.....	3,200,000	96,000
Ohio.....	66,100,000	1,983,000
Oklahoma.....	16,000,000	480,000
Oregon.....	13,700,000	411,000
Pennsylvania.....	78,000,000	2,340,000
Rhode Island.....	100,000	3,000
South Carolina.....	8,500,000	255,000
South Dakota.....	4,000,000	120,000
Tennessee.....	17,200,000	516,000
Texas.....	70,000,000	2,100,000
Utah.....	3,400,000	102,000
Vermont.....	1,400,000	42,000
Virginia.....	5,200,000	156,000
Washington.....	13,000,000	390,000
West Virginia.....	7,800,000	234,000
Wisconsin.....	15,000,000	450,000
Wyoming.....	4,800,000	144,000
Total.....	1,000,000,000	30,000,000

THE NEW AIR MAIL BILL

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the new air mail legislation.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, every well-informed supporter of air mail legislation will find cause for deep gratification in being given the opportunity to support the bill H. R. 6511, introduced by the Chairman of the Post Office Committee [Mr. MEAD]. This bill amends the present temporary air mail legislation and makes definite and important improvements as regards the regulation and compensation of the air mail carriers. The aircraft industry in America has set up an operating system which has become the envy of the rest of the world and should properly be extended a badly needed helping hand. The problem of protecting the industry is recognized as a vital one.

The Mead bill empowers the Interstate Commerce Commission to fix rates and to increase them up to a maximum of 20 percent above those in existing law.

Under this provision rates up to 48 cents an airplane-mile for the transportation of mail loads in excess of 300 pounds and 38 cents a mile for loads of 300 pounds or less may be fixed. That this is moderate compensation is evident when it is realized that it cost the Post Office Department \$2.21 a mile to have the mail transported by the Army. The bill further makes the rate-of-pay findings of the Interstate Commerce Commission effective as of March 1, 1935, and thus gives promise of prompt financial relief, which is imperatively needed by the industry, in view of the fact that some companies have only sufficient funds to carry on for a few weeks or months, and that even the largest are rapidly depleting their cash reserves while operating at the sacrificial rates bid only to retain the territory which they had pioneered.

The bill further takes a long step toward preventing the paralleling of existing air mail routes, which must depend for revenue to an important degree on passenger and express receipts by lines not having an air mail contract on those routes. It also removes the power of cancelation of con-

tracts from the Postmaster General and vests it in the Interstate Commerce Commission after due hearing. The bill thus virtually establishes certificates of convenience and necessity, taking a step toward permanency in the business which has been lacking heretofore.

The bill contains many improvements over the air mail bill passed in the Seventy-third Congress; it affords protection to the public and has the approval of a majority of the air lines; leaves responsibility, administration, and decision where those things properly belong, and should go a long way toward the improvement of the distressed condition which threatens the air transport system of the country.

Mr. Speaker, in conclusion, I desire to make a statement clarifying the erroneous impression which seems to exist on the minority side of the House through statements that have been made by members of the minority party, because they intimate that lobbyists, including Mr. Elliott Roosevelt, the son of the President, have lobbied for this legislation. This is an absolutely untrue statement and could be expected to come only from false-hearted men, or from one who is woefully misinformed.

I am most reliably informed that neither the President's son nor any member of his family have ever contacted a single member of the Post Office Committee in behalf of this legislation, nor has young Mr. Roosevelt or any member of his family approached the Post Office Department in this connection.

My informant, for whom I have the very highest regard, advised me that the President's son is not engaged in any way in any business that has to do with the carriage of air mail. I have learned, however, that his services have been engaged by a number of transport lines, as a technical advisor and arbitrator, and has to do with express and passenger business only.

His duties require him to travel considerably; he employs a secretary and a stenographer; his expenses, including the salaries paid his employees, are all borne by himself; and his own salary is comparable to that of any man employed in a similar capacity. These attacks upon the Chief Executive and his family are unworthy of the gentleman who gave voice to them and are wholly unwarranted and unjustified.

It is my understanding that Mr. Elliott Roosevelt has never attempted to intercede in any matters dealing with the Post Office Department; in fact, so far as my informant has been able to ascertain, he has never been in the Post Office Building.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR RELIEF (H. J. RES. 117)

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 174, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 174

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 117, with Senate amendments thereto, be, and the same is hereby, taken from the Speaker's table; that the Senate amendments be, and they are hereby, disagreed to by the House; that the conference requested by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the said joint resolution be, and hereby is, agreed to by the House; that the Speaker shall immediately appoint managers on the part of the House without intervening motion; and that the managers on the part of the House are hereby given specific authority to agree, with or without amendment, or disagree to any amendment of the Senate to the said joint resolution notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RANKIN. Of course, this rule is not subject to amendment at present; but if we should vote down the previous question on the rule, then the rule would be open to amendment, as I understand it.

The SPEAKER. To any germane amendment, that is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, before the gentleman does that, let us have an understanding about how the time is going to be divided.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Under the usual practice, I yield 30 minutes to the minority member of the Committee on Rules, to yield as he sees fit. That leaves 30 minutes on this side to be yielded.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, as I understand it, when the gentleman speaks of the minority, he refers to the political minority, the Republican organization. We represent a group which we think is in the majority opposing the adoption of this rule. I want to know how much of that time is going to be allotted to us who oppose the adoption of the rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Of course, I have no idea what the minority party is going to do. On this side I have many requests for time. Until a Member speaks I have no way of knowing whether he is for the resolution or opposed. I have the distinguished gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], for instance, heading the list.

Mr. RANKIN. I think there is at least one member of the Committee on Rules who is opposed to this rule—the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. O'CONNOR. I understand that gentleman has time. Mr. RANKIN. But does he have time to yield to other Members who are opposed to the rule?

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; that is never done. That is not in accord with the rules of the House to yield to a Member to yield to others.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, it seems to me an arrangement should be made whereby 50 percent of this time would go to the members of this House who are opposed to this rule. I want to know if they are going to yield just to two or three of us and then take up the rest of the time in favor of the rule. If that is so, I submit it is hardly fair to the Membership of the House.

The SPEAKER. That is a question that the Chair cannot answer.

Mr. RANKIN. I want to know from the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] and the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] whether they are going to yield time to Members who are opposed to the rule. I ask if the gentleman from Pennsylvania and the gentleman from New York, the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, will not agree to yield to the Members who are opposed to the adoption of this rule one-half of the time?

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I have already agreed to yield 5 minutes to the only one who is known to me as a "silverite" requesting time. I cannot yield time unless Members of the House come to me and make the request. All of my time is now allotted.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Will not the gentleman withhold that for a moment to let me ask the gentleman from New York a question?

Mr. MILLARD. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. While I intend to vote for the rule to send the bill to conference, the Democrats on this side of the aisle who see fit to oppose the rule, ought not to be forced to go to the other side of the aisle for time where they are opposed to any rule. I think the organization and the Democratic leadership on our Rules Committee ought to always make it possible for men of our own party to get time from our own side of the aisle.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Has the gentleman concluded?

Mr. BLANTON. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman surely understands that the Democrats have 10 Members on the Committee on Rules, among whom 30 minutes is to be divided, while the minority party has only four Members on that committee with 30 minutes to be divided among them.

Mr. BLANTON. But we have a Texas Democrat on the Rules Committee [Mr. DIES] who is opposed to this rule. A certain amount of time ought to be assigned to the members of the Rules Committee who are opposing this resolution. All of the hour should not be controlled by proponents of the rule. I understand that the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] and possibly another Democrat on the Rules Committee are both opposed to the rule.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I have no such knowledge, and all I can say is that I have allotted time in opposition to the rule to every request that has been made of me. I do not know what all this fuss is about.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DUFFEY of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. When the gentleman says that he has allotted time to all Members who have requested time, I assume that he refers to the list that I gave him?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes, sir; partially.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. That list was made up on the granting of only 10 minutes' time. We allotted that to four Members, while the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES] was given 5 minutes by the minority, making 15 minutes all told.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman will appreciate that the Rules Committee is bringing in a rule and that we have 10 Democratic members on the Rules Committee. Surely the custom in this House is that members of the reporting committee have prior recognition. I will say to the gentleman that those four requests are in behalf of Members of the House who are not members of the Rules Committee.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. What I want to make clear is this, that that 10 minutes represents all the time we could get by consent.

Mr. O'CONNOR. As to this side of the aisle, that is correct.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. Why not ask unanimous consent for an extension of time of a half an hour and give it to those opposed to the resolution. I am for the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is agreeable to me and was my intention.

Mr. COCHRAN. That is right. Let us be fair. I am with the gentleman from New York, but I think the opposition should have an opportunity to be heard.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield for me to make the request?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] yield to the gentleman from Mississippi for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I prefer to make it myself as I intended, because this request does not come as anything new. We had an understanding on both sides of the aisle that if there was demand for more time, I would make a request for additional time.

Mr. RANKIN. I did not know that.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We have had a lot of excitement about nothing.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time for consideration of the rule be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. RANKIN. With the understanding that that 30 minutes is to be yielded to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES], who represents the opposition to the resolution.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I can make no such agreement.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman wants to be fair with us, he will agree to give us this 30 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is out of order. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has the floor.

Mr. RANKIN. But I reserve the right to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has been recognized to present the rule. Does the gentleman from New York yield to the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I did ask unanimous consent to extend the time on the rule 30 minutes in spite of all this unreasonable talk about being "fair"—a bromide too often used in this House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time be extended 30 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, the gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the time be extended for 30 minutes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Do we get our half?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Surely.

The SPEAKER. One-half of the time to be controlled by the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY] and one-half by himself. Is there objection?

Mr. RANKIN. Reserving the right to object.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is, is there objection?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. LEHLBACH. I would like to ask how much time the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] has consumed?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not consumed any time. This discussion was under a reservation.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, we are opposed to the adoption of this rule to send this bill to conference, for the simple reason that we want the Senate amendments adopted. If this bill is sent to conference, we have notice served from the other end of the Capitol that no matter what change is made, when it comes back from conference it will be debated indefinitely in the Senate.

So we are asking you to vote down the previous question on the rule, so that we may amend it and adopt the Senate amendments.

I know those amendments will be attacked. They were attacked yesterday. We were told that certain Members in control of this legislation did not care what some of us thought, but in my humble opinion the Senate has greatly improved this measure. When you talk about the ability of a committee of the House to straighten out legislation, I call attention to the fact that at the other end of the Capitol there are 96 Members who are just about as able, taken as a whole, as the membership of this House.

We were told when this bill was passed by the House that they were in a terrific hurry. They did not give us time to debate the bill and put on amendments that many of us would like to have supported. They hurried it through. It went through the House and went to the Senate and it was debated there for 2 solid months. Now they come here, because they want to get rid of certain amendments, and intimate that those amendments would destroy the bill. They are not appropriation amendments. They are legislative amendments that the House has jurisdiction to pass upon. Now they want to take it to conference and take out some of those amendments which are already proving to be beneficial.

I know there are men here who do not want any expansion, who do not want any liberalization of our financial structure, but they cannot deny the fact that since this silver amendment was adopted in the Senate, there has been a steady rise in commodity prices throughout the country.

Nothing, in my opinion, that has been done at this session of Congress will do the American people more good than to accept these amendments en bloc and send this bill to the President at once. That is the reason we are making our fight. It is not pleasant for us, we men who have been gagged, as it were, here for months; it is not pleasant to have to fight against the well-organized machine, but we are fighting the battles of the American people because we believe that if this bill is passed in its present form and sent to the other end of the Avenue and signed at once it will do more toward starting this country back on the path of recovery than anything that has been passed at this session of Congress.

For these reasons we are opposing this rule. We are going to vote against the previous question. If the previous question is voted down it gives us the right to move to amend the rule so as to accept these amendments en bloc, or to accept them one at a time. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN].

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, the Senate placed on House Joint Resolution 117, 30 amendments, many of them impractical of administration, which will hamper the President in giving us an efficient administration of the vast sum appropriated.

If I had the time I could demonstrate beyond question that the bill as it has been amended by the Senate is impractical of efficient administration in many respects. I could demonstrate to you beyond question that even the allotment made for specific objects is useless, for the money is not available under the law for expenditure for those objects. I could demonstrate to you beyond question that when they make an allotment of \$40,000,000 for schools, that it is less than the schools will get under another amendment if properly arranged which will be of more value in giving employment in the school system. I could demonstrate to you beyond question how unfeasible is the authorization that this money shall be available for the A. A. A., the Agricultural Adjustment Administration. The whole amount is available for that; the entire \$4,880,000,000 is available under Senate amendments. The Secretary of Agriculture does not want it, he does not need it; and this amendment makes no mention of and no provision for reduction of processing taxes or elimination of processing taxes. In other words, the processing tax goes on for the support of the A. A. A. and this Senate amendment authorizes the expenditure of any amount of this appropriation also to conduct the A. A. A. Why not just turn the whole blamed business over to the A. A. A. and be done with it? That is one point.

I am not going to discuss the silver amendment, but an analysis of section 4 of the amendment shows that it vests the greatest arbitrary power in a Cabinet officer that has ever been vested by act of Congress. It gives him the power to make settlements on agreed prices for silver in satisfaction of any balances due the United States, foreign or domestic; yet they want to swallow section 4 of the silver amendment.

Another objectionable amendment is one stating that the men designated by the President or appointed by the President as personnel cannot discharge their duties or receive their salaries until confirmed by the mighty Senate, giving to the Senate an ax over the allocation of these funds; and what chance would any Member of this House have under such conditions and circumstances?

Another Senate amendment provides for classification, by means of which every employee will have to be classified before he can enter on the discharge of his duties, and even employees already in the Government service will have to be classified. Throughout, the positions created under this bill will have to be classified first, and this will take months and months.

The Senate added a road amendment. I will bet there are not 10 men in this House who can tell what it means. The road amendment appropriates even for the authorized appropriation that we carried in our agricultural bill that passed the House the other day. It provides for such a peculiar allocation of this fund that it would take a Philadelphia lawyer to tell how much this State or that State will receive.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 additional minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. BUCHANAN. The Senate has adopted an amendment with regard to railroad crossings which allocates money for the elimination of crossings upon a certain rule laid down in the bill. This rule does not recognize the number of railroad crossings in the centers of population

and dense traffic, but takes them on a general population basis, road area, railroad mileage, and includes highways in Hawaii. Has Hawaii any railroad crossings at all? If so, I never saw one in that Territory. There are a few little railroads there, sugarcane roads, freight railroads, if you please, yet a vast amount of this money would be frozen until 1937, allocated under that road amendment to Hawaii.

Oh, yes, you fine Members are willing to swallow every one of these impractical and wrong amendments merely for the sake of getting the silver amendment the Senate tacked onto this bill. Now, Mr. Speaker, let me make this statement: I am not set for or against any amendment in this bill. I am holding an open mind to go to conference as a conferee should go, to adjust these amendments, agree to such amendments of the Senate as are practical, or amend Senate amendments in such a way as to give us an efficient administration of the bill and give the President an opportunity to bring about the great results he contemplates under this bill.

Mr. Speaker, the bill should go to conference to be systematized. Additional amendments should be suggested and adopted, because the bill is impractical.

If left like it is, it will hamper the administration to a certain extent, and may mean the difference between failure and success of this appropriation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, those of us on this side of the House who are supporting the resolution are not interested in any factional warfare that may be raging over on the other side; neither do we by our vote give approval to the measure which is pending before the House. We are simply supporting the rule because we believe a great question like this, involving nearly \$5,000,000,000, should be considered in the regular, orderly, and usual way. Bills invariably are referred to the conferees for their examination and consideration before being acted upon in the House. For this reason we are supporting the rule which upholds the usual procedure.

Mr. Speaker, no one sacrifices any rights he may have in sending this bill to conference as provided under the rule. All the amendments in this bill must eventually come back to the House, and ultimately the majority of the House will prevail. I am in favor of some of these amendments. For instance, I would like to have the House concur immediately in the amendment offered by Senator GEORGE, of Georgia. I believe it is a real relief amendment and one which would bring genuine relief to hundreds of thousands of workers in the textile industry, who, unless they do get relief from the processing tax, will be unable to find work. Many mills are being forced out of business because of this tax. However, I am willing to have this great problem considered by the conferees. I am willing to have their judgment, and then I am going to reserve the right, when they bring back the legislation, to insist upon the amendment. We are not afraid of an inquiry into the merits of our cause. I repeat I believe there is no justification to depart from the usual procedure and consequently will support the rule.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. DIES].

Mr. DIES. Mr. Speaker, it is our purpose to vote against the previous question in order to enable the House to vote on the question of whether or not they want to concur in all of the Senate amendments in gross. If the House does not want to concur in all these Senate amendments in gross, then by voting down the rule the bill goes back to the Appropriations Committee; the Appropriations Committee reports on it, and the bill comes back to the House in order to give the Members of the House an opportunity to pass on these amendments. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the Senate had 8 weeks in which to consider this legislation, and yet the House is expected to delegate the authority to five conferees to go into conference and decide upon questions that this House and this House

alone is entitled to decide upon. There is no use for us to deceive ourselves. The conferees are not going to agree to these amendments and the Senate conferees are not going to agree to them. If you are in favor of the amendments giving \$40,000,000 to the schools, allocating \$800,000,000 to roads and grade crossings, \$350,000,000 to rivers and harbors, and \$500,000,000 for soil erosion, irrigation, and drainage; if you favor the establishment of a principle by which the President may be guided in accordance with the Supreme Court's decision in the Amazon case; to chart his course without taking all discretion away from him, you will vote down the previous question. We will thereby say to the President: "Within this chartered course you may act." If we want to assume our constitutional responsibility, why hazard it by sending this bill to conference?

Mr. Speaker, for a long time we have been legislating by delegating authority. The Senate has been more deliberative than we have. The Senate has taken its own time. We have been asked time and time again to enact legislation in a period of 1 hour. Then the bill goes to the Senate, and the Senate adds a lot of amendments and we send it to conference. The conferees disagree. The Senate then says to the country: "We wanted to help the people, but the House of Representatives would not permit us to do so."

It seems to me that the question is squarely up to the Members of this House right now. If we favor these beneficial amendments, we ought to give the House an opportunity to concur. If we are not in favor of concurring in all the amendments, then why not vote down the rule and send it back to the Appropriations Committee? Let it come back to this great body again. Shall we sacrifice our dignity, our power, and our prerogatives? [Applause.]

There is not anyone that can say that the President is opposed to this bill. Conferences were held between the White House and the Senate during its progress. Not one man can say that the President will veto this measure. Why should we be asked to delegate our authority when the other body is proceeding under its constitutional power and giving to these matters careful consideration? Only this morning I saw a statement of the president of the Parent Teachers Association and the head of the Y. W. C. A. saying that unless this \$40,000,000 appropriation is made available immediately schools will continue to close all over the country. They are closing down now. In a few weeks the C. C. C. camps will cease to exist. These amendments authorize the President to rehabilitate the stricken agricultural areas and to establish tenant farmers upon their own farms. Will we permit the C. C. C. camps to close?

Mr. RANDOLPH. In 1 more week.

Mr. DIES. Yes; in 1 more week. Relief is needed all over the country.

Mr. Speaker, a bloc has been formed in the Senate, according to the morning paper, and this bloc, according to their statement, will filibuster for 2 months or more if we do not act now upon these amendments. Are you in favor of chartering the course of the Executive? Do you think it is unreasonable for Congress to put some limitation, to direct a chartered course, to prescribe some rules to guide the President in accordance with the Supreme Court's decision in the Amazon case?

Whether we prevail or not, it is our effort to give Members of the House the full opportunity to say what you want to do with the Senate amendments. If you do not want to concur in all of them, by voting down the rule you can send the bill to the Appropriations Committee, bring it back on the floor, and let this legislative body that formerly was the greatest body on the face of the earth pass upon them. In view of the limited time allotted to me, I may extend my remarks at some later time to set forth the many reasons why we should afford the House an opportunity to pass upon these amendments and insure the immediate passage of this bill in constitutional form and with beneficial and constructive provisions. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask that all Members who speak may have permission to revise and extend their

remarks, and also that all Members may have 5 legislative days within which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

Mr. DOCKWEILER. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I am for this rule because I want to send the bill to conference and take advantage of the amendments that have been made by the Senate that are good and throw out the amendments of the Senate that are bad and will not work.

The bill is bad enough anyway. [Applause.] I do not want to see it made worse by the adoption of the amendments of the Senate that are bad, and, frankly, I believe that the inflation amendment that was put in the bill is bad.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Does not the gentleman believe that the amendment will be perfectly safe in the hands of the present Secretary of the Treasury?

Mr. TABER. No, I do not. I have not the confidence in him that some of you folks who want to see a lot of paper money printed seem to have.

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. If the gentleman will look up his record during the past 2 years I am sure he will conclude that he is perfectly safe.

Mr. TABER. Not when they have cut the dollar about in two.

This is the same bill that we had before the House of Representatives a couple of months ago, away back in January.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. This is the same bill which, at that time, had to be passed in 48 hours or the country would not have any relief money.

Mr. TABER. That is correct, and there is only \$300,000,000 available now for relief money after taking care of relief all this time.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman honestly think this is the most atrocious and abominable measure ever presented to a legislative body?

Mr. TABER. It is perfectly ridiculous. [Laughter and applause.] It is not a work relief bill, and I am going to demonstrate this.

Mr. SHORT. Does not the gentleman feel that it is a slush fund?

Mr. TABER. Yes; it is.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I cannot yield now. I will yield in a moment.

This bill is not a work-relief bill. When the message came up here from the President of the United States we were told that he would be able to put 3,500,000 men to work by July 1. The actual fact is that the only item they have in contemplation that will provide any substantial employment is the highway item, which cannot be functioning at all before the 1st of October and cannot be functioning generally before the 1st of January next year, and most of it will take 15 months to be put in operation.

This is a bad bill from beginning to end; except for the direct relief that is contained in it, it is a fraud on the American people. [Applause.]

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Yes; I yield.

Mr. REED of New York. I would like to ask the gentleman when he speaks of the highway item functioning by

the 1st of October or the 1st of January, does he not mean that the contracts will be let at about that time?

Mr. TABER. The contracts will be let in about that time and they will get to work in full blast perhaps a year and a half from now.

Mr. SHORT. And then the contracts are not to be let to private contractors but performed by hired day labor.

Mr. TABER. And insofar as they are performed by hired day labor it will be a waste and destruction of the people's money, with nothing to show for it.

Mr. SHORT. I agree with the gentleman absolutely.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. Is there any provision in the bill for taking care of the Democratic deficit of 1934?

Mr. TABER. I do not know how they are going to be able to work that, but, maybe, it is kind of covered up like, you know.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me now for a question?

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. RANKIN. Did I understand the gentleman to say that he voted against the bill on its passage when it was before the House?

Mr. TABER. Oh, certainly.

Mr. RANKIN. Some Members on the gentleman's side of the House asked that this money be allocated or that some limitations be put on the allocation of it. I was one of the men who agreed to that proposition, and now the Senate has put it in the bill.

Mr. TABER. I am going to read those allocations, so the House will know what kind of fake it is.

Mr. RANKIN. Does not the gentleman believe that that improves the bill?

Mr. TABER. Eight hundred million dollars for roads, which is the only item that might, perhaps, bring some work relief and that one year and a half hence.

Five hundred million dollars for reclamation, a fraud on the American farmer, and no work for at least a year and a half.

One hundred million dollars for electrification, which cannot provide any employment at all to speak of and is just for the promotion of a scheme on the part of the administration and is not for relief.

Four hundred and fifty million dollars for housing, which is a year away in the letting of the contracts, a year and a half away in providing employment, and then not very much employment.

Projects for professional and clerical persons, \$300,000,000. I do not know what this is. I do not believe anyone else does.

Civilian Conservation Corps, \$600,000,000. This is just enough to provide an increase of, perhaps, 125,000 or 130,000 above what they are running now.

Loans or grants for projects of States, Territories, and the District of Columbia or political subdivisions or agencies thereof, \$900,000,000.

One hundred and thirty-eight million dollars have been allotted to one city for this purpose, and the number of people who have been given employment under it is 2,254. This is the way it works and this is the way it will work in this bill—a total loss.

Mr. BEITER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Except for the direct relief, there is nothing to the bill. We do not want to make it any worse and we want to get rid of the bad things the Senate has put in and not have it as bad as it is now.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I want to call attention to one other thing about the rule, which I think the House ought to understand, before I go any further, and I cannot yield until I do this.

There has been a question raised here—not on the floor, but in private conversation on the part of several Members—

as to the construction of the language of the last part of the rule—as to the conferees being given authority—

To agree with or without amendment, or disagree to any amendment of the Senate to the said joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX.

The effect of that, as I understand it, is to permit the conferees to agree to any Senate amendment on any subject, whether it is legislation or not, put in by a Senate amendment, notwithstanding it may not be authorized by law, and to incorporate it in the conference report, so that they can be voted on at one time instead of having separate votes on the amendments.

I think the rule should be adopted and the bill sent to conference and made just as little objectionable to the needs of the country as possible. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker and Members, when my namesake from Massachusetts rises in his place as spokesman of his party and for the first time in the history of this administration supports a rule of this character, it indicates to my mind that the Grand Old Party has not lost any of the wisdom and cunning of the serpent. [Laughter.] I want to say to my colleagues on this side of the aisle that if they did not know before how they ought to vote on this rule, they ought to know now. [Applause.]

They see trouble ahead for the majority in sending these amendments to conference. They see trouble ahead at the other end of the Capitol, it is openly threatened, which may keep it on the calendar for another month.

Mr. Speaker, the country demands action, and the advisers of the President would be wise if they counseled him to accept the Senate amendments and sign the bill and put it into effect at once. We have been here now nearly 3 months without completing a single piece of important legislation, and the national reaction is distinctly not good.

Throughout the country there have sprung up great schemes, enlisting great followings, to bring about prosperity. The people, in their distraction over the economic conditions they have suffered so long, make me think of a man perishing of thirst in a desert, and he sees all about him illusions of water—springs and rivers and lakes—and he rushes to plunge in and slake his burning thirst. To my mind it indicates that the morale of the people is sagging under the strain, and that if a distinct turn for the better does not come soon—and certainly if it does not come within the next 12 months—we may witness the most radical political upheaval, economic in its nature, this country has ever witnessed.

The gentleman from Texas [Mr. BUCHANAN], Chairman of the Appropriations Committee, objects to this monetary legislation and says that it is extraneous to the bill. I want to say that it is not any more extraneous to this bill than the first inflation amendment was to the farm bill. This Congress is so hampered by organization methods and powers and by gag rules, that it is only by extraneous methods we can get anything through that the people want. [Applause.]

Now, I am not for the Thomas amendment primarily for the benefit of mining, to get more mining—I am for it to get more money. We have been trying everything on God's earth to bring us out of the depression except money, and the depression is still with us. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend this very excellent speech of mine in the RECORD. [Laughter.]

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request of the gentleman from Colorado is granted. [Laughter.]

Mr. MARTIN of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, the Thomas amendment to the Public Works bill is the simplest and most definite and most conservative piece of monetary legislation which has been proposed in Congress during this administration. Before pointing out to you just what this amendment does, I want to call your attention for a moment to the law

as it now is, as found in the Silver Purchase Act, approved June 19, 1934, the last day of the last Congress.

That act authorized and directed the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase silver, at home and abroad, in the markets of the world, at such times and upon such terms as he might deem in the national interest, with a limitation that no purchase of silver situated in the United States on May 1, 1934, should be bought at a price in excess of 50 cents an ounce. The Secretary of the Treasury was further authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against all such silver bullion in a face amount not less than the cost of all silver purchased, and it was further directed that such certificates should be placed in "actual" circulation. These silver certificates were made legal tender for all purposes, public and private, and were redeemable in standard silver dollars.

Under the Thomas amendment to the pending Public Works bill the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to issue silver certificates against all silver bullion now held or hereafter acquired at its monetary value and to place such silver certificates in immediate circulation, and, what is even more important, to keep them in circulation by reissuing them when they return to the Treasury, as has been done for the past 55 years in the case of the greenbacks of the Civil War. That is all there is to it. The other two provisions of the amendment are discretionary: The amendment that the Secretary may, in his discretion, exchange gold for silver, which he is already doing, and the amendment that he may, in his discretion, accept silver in settlement of foreign debts. He already has these powers to a limited extent in existing laws.

It may be, as claimed, that the Secretary of the Treasury has exercised very little of the discretionary power vested in him by the enabling silver legislation passed in the Seventy-third Congress, and that he has not carried out the directions of the Silver Purchase Act. Whatever the fact may be, the Silver Purchase Act has done one great thing, it has exploded the fallacy that there are available such vast stores of cheap silver that its remonetization would submerge and wash away our monetary system. This fallacy was disproved once for all by the fact that under the nationalization-of-silver provisions of the Silver Purchase Act, being section 7 of that act, the Treasury, after a campaign of 90 days in the fall of 1934, was able to capture only 112,000,000 ounces of hoarded silver in the United States, a mere trifle compared with the total of our monetary stocks, not equaling 2 percent of the total volume of five and one-half billions of money in existence in the country, equaling little more than 1 percent of the total stock of gold in the Treasury.

Ever since I can remember the great obstacle to the recognition of silver as money was the supposedly great quantity of cheap silver available for such purposes. That argument is gone forever.

In addition to the 112,000,000 ounces recaptured under the nationalization provision, it is reported that the Treasury has acquired some 200,000,000 ounces by purchase abroad. It is estimated that the Treasury, on the whole, has acquired about 400,000,000 ounces of silver at not to exceed 50 cents an ounce. If certificates have been issued against this silver at its face value, it would amount to \$200,000,000. If certificates could be issued against this silver at a monetary value of \$1.29 an ounce, instead of 50 cents, the price paid for it, it is estimated that it would expand the circulating medium of the country between three and four hundred million dollars, and the people need it.

Mr. Speaker, attention has been called to the fact that a limit of 50 cents an ounce was placed on the purchase price of hoarded silver. I want to call your attention to the fact that in New York and London on yesterday silver was 60 cents an ounce, an increase of 20 percent over the Government price. What would it be if we did for it what we have done for gold, which went arbitrarily, by executive fiat, from \$20.67 per ounce to \$35 per ounce? I have asked the question before, and I ask it again, what would be the position and value of silver in the money stocks of the world today had as much been done to preserve its historic status and value as has been done to kill it?

The Thomas amendment to the public-works bill does not require the Secretary of the Treasury to purchase an ounce of silver. It does not require him to pay any given price for it. It merely requires him to issue silver certificates against the bullion now in the Treasury or hereafter acquired. He can acquire no such amount as to result in a dangerous expansion of the currency. This was shown by the action of China placing a 20-percent export tax on her silver shortly after the Silver Purchase Act went into effect. India and China, the great silver money countries of the world, want to keep their silver and keep it cheap, so they can undersell the dear dollars of other countries. If we want to do business with them, we must bring our dollars down and bring their dollars up. We are in a position now to control the monetary policy of the world, and it is not only to our interest to control it, but our very economic salvation depends upon it. Our dear money and higher standards of living, resulting in high costs of production, are losing us the markets of the world. It is high time we counteracted this trend. The real objection to this silver legislation should be that it is so limited that its results will be almost imperceptible. We would scarcely know in a year that it was in operation. I feel just as confident of this now as I felt a year ago that no great stores of silver were in hoarding in this country or were available in the world for purchase by this country.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that the money question will be an issue in the next campaign. I believe that the people are fed up on bonds. I believe that if the proposition before us could be submitted to a vote of the people it would be overwhelmingly approved. I believe it would carry ever farm State in the Union. A vote against this amendment is a vote against money and a vote for bonds, interest, and taxes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER].

Mr. MILLER. Mr. Speaker, with all the earnestness I can command, I call the attention of the House to the position that we are about to be jockeyed into and into which we will be jockeyed if this rule is adopted. The rule provides—

And that the managers on the part of the House are hereby given specific authority to agree, with or without amendment, or disagree to any amendment of the Senate to the said joint resolution, notwithstanding the provisions of clause 2 of rule XX.

Adopt this rule and here is what you do: You say to the conferees, Go out and represent us; we delegate to you the whole authority of the House of Representatives; go out and agree to any amendment that you want to, and reject any amendment that you want to, and report back with any amendments you may desire. Then the only question that will come to us, and the only thing that we can vote on is to vote up or down the conference report. By the adoption of this rule we are depriving ourselves of the right to pass on these amendments. Some gentlemen may do that, if they so desire, but I am not going to consent to any such procedure. I am not going to delegate my authority and my individual responsibility as a Member of this House. [Applause.] We ought to have the right under the rules of this House to say what amendments we want to adopt, in what amendments we want to concur, and the amendments we want to reject, but you cannot do this if this rule is adopted. When the vote on the previous question comes, we should vote the previous question down by voting "no", so that we may be able to amend the rule and thus be in a position to consider the amendments upon their merits. If the amendments are not proper, we may disagree with the Senate. If they are meritorious, then we should concur in them; but if this rule is adopted or if the previous question is ordered so that we cannot amend the rule, we place ourselves absolutely in the hands of the conferees and must adopt their report when it comes back, regardless of what may happen to the amendments which would give us relief for our schools and which would provide for the building of roads. It is inconceivable that any Member may willingly surrender his constitutional rights as a representative of the people who sent him here, and,

in effect, say to them, I am willing for the conferees to determine these questions and I shall gladly follow them. If you vote for the previous question and thus preclude your right to amend the rule and then adopt the rule as now offered, you surrender your prerogative and right to determine what the terms of this legislation may be and will later face the question of the adoption of a conference report containing the terms of this vital legislation which you had no part in framing or adopting.

The adoption of this rule means delay in the Senate on the conference report. That body will exercise its rights and assert its judgment regardless of the conference report, but when we adopt this rule on the previous question, we foreclose all our rights as individual Representatives.

I want to be in harmony with our leadership, but I cannot and will not surrender my rights as a Representative of a free people for the sake of harmony. [Applause.] I appeal to you to exercise your own judgment in matters affecting our Nation and stop this further delegation of power and surrender of our rights. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Arkansas has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Speaker, about 8 weeks ago we had before us for consideration House Joint Resolution 117, which is commonly known as the public-works appropriation bill and contemplates the appropriation by Congress of approximately \$5,000,000,000 for direct relief to the distressed people of the United States and for Public Works projects calculated to stimulate private industry by vast expenditures of public money. This bill, like almost all other new-deal bills, was brought in under a gag rule limiting debate on this vast appropriation to a very few hours. The argument was made at that time that the misery, poverty, and starvation of millions of people in this country demanded immediate action on our part. It was argued that the bill should be passed without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t" so that the President's great relief program could go forward unhampered, and that he be given absolute control of the expenditure of the vast sum of money to be appropriated by the resolution. The House Members at that time listened to the Chairman and prominent members of the Rules Committee and adopted the rule. We then listened to a few hours of debate on the part of the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the members of that committee, and, at the conclusion of debate, without having had power to amend the bill at all, we passed it as it was submitted by the Appropriations Committee and transmitted it to the Senate for action by that body.

Since then we have stood by helplessly while the Senate of the United States debated that bill for 8 weeks, sending it back to the Finance Committee of the Senate on one occasion and having it reported by that committee for the second time. During the debate in the Senate the argument was made time and time again that the suffering people of the United States were demanding immediate action on the bill by the Senate. Every argument was made by administration leaders in the Senate in favor of prompt action. The Senate, which is the other great deliberative body of Congress, thoroughly analyzed the bill, exercised its constitutional function of amendment and, on Saturday last, March 23, finally passed it, having added 31 amendments to the bill as it originally passed the House.

It was presented to this body yesterday in the hope that we would give unanimous consent that it be sent to the conference committee selected from the House and Senate. In my opinion, the Senators known as the administration leaders intend that in the conference many of the amendments perfected in the Senate shall be stricken out. I think it is also the intention of the administration leaders in the House that the conference committee will strike many of the amendments added by the Senate. After the conference committee finishes with its work, the conference report will be submitted to the House and to the Senate and will be voted

either up or down; but in all probability the House and the Senate will be precluded from taking any further vote on the bill or any of the amendments, and they will be limited exclusively to a vote on the conference report.

It is my humble opinion that the Senate amendments are mostly beneficial to the people of the United States. The President's power has to some extent been limited and the vast sum provided for is allocated to several types of public-works projects. Certainly the President should not object to some guidance from Congress in the expenditure of this vast sum of money. Certainly he cannot ask the Congress to forego its rights entirely in directing to some extent at least how this money should be spent. I am opposed to the rule now pending before us, because I am fearful that if it is passed and this bill goes to conference many weeks will pass before the bill finally becomes a law, and, while Congress debates, the people in distress will suffer. I have considered the Senate amendments and I find none that seriously impair the bill.

It is my opinion that immediate action is imperative. It is imperative to save the C. C. C. projects which will expire on April 1 unless money is appropriated to carry them on. Schools throughout the United States are closing for lack of funds; one of the Senate amendments provides \$40,000,000 for the relief of schools. These relief measures are vital to the happiness and welfare of a stricken people, and the importance of prompt action is far greater than the supposed injurious effect of any amendment that is in the bill. We have listened this morning to the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee who in a general way referred to some of the Senate amendments, but certainly did not enlighten us at all as to how these amendments, or any of them, would be injurious to the administration of the bill or to the people of the United States. He simply told us that he had been advised by administrative officials and employees that the bill was unworkable.

The people choose the Members of the Senate and the House to enact legislation for them, not the heads of the administrative departments in Washington, and for my part, I would rather depend on the deliberate action of the Senate in this matter than on the criticism of the department and bureau heads. In my opinion, we are conferring a favor on the President of the United States if we concur in the Senate amendments and send this bill to the White House for his immediate action. We were advised when the bill first came to this branch of the Congress that the President was demanding immediate action. We responded to his demand, and in my opinion we should now continue to respond to his demand in concurring in the Senate amendments immediately, and sending the bill to the White House for his signature. If speed was imperative 8 weeks ago then certainly the demand for speed has not lessened in 8 weeks.

We see today in the debate the prominent leaders on the Republican side joining the distinguished Chairman of the Rules Committee and the distinguished Chairman of the Appropriations Committee in asking support for this rule. When I see the distinguished leaders on the Republican side joining with the Democrats I immediately become skeptical. They tell you that they are opposed to the bill in any form, that they are opposed to the amendments. I believe that they are telling you the truth, and in my opinion nothing would suit the Republican side of this House more than to see the passage of this relief bill held up for another month. The people are outraged at the delay already occasioned in the passage of this bill, and if I am any judge of the demand of our constituents at this time it is that we pass this bill without further delay and I urge my colleagues on the Democratic side at least to give them immediate action by defeating the rule and concurring in the Senate amendment en bloc.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO].

Mr. MARCANTONIO. Mr. Speaker, I believe that we are going through a great deal of shadow boxing this morning and making a great hullabaloo about nothing, because when

the Senate and this House voted down the prevailing wage scale amendment the American workers lost their last ditch fight in the Congress of the United States. Whether or not you adopt these Senate amendments, whether you send the joint resolution to conference or do not send it to conference, is immaterial, because none of these amendments mean a thing to the wage earners of this Nation. We have thrown \$4,000,000,000 into the labor market at an average scale of \$28 for unskilled labor to about \$55 a month for skilled labor. Mr. Speaker, this bill sounds the death knell of the American standard of living of American labor. We have reduced American labor to the economic status of the slaves who built the pyramids of ancient Egypt. None of the Senate amendments remedy this situation, and it is most unfortunate that we cannot do anything here because of our rules. That is why I say we are only shadow boxing here. If this matter comes to a record vote, I am going to vote "present" in order to record my protest against this mockery that is now going on before this House. The spokesmen of the present administration have forced the American workers to surrender their economic gains, acquired after years of struggle on the economic battle front. These spokesmen by this bill now say to American labor, "We know you are starving; and if you want to be fed, you must become regimented on the basis of a charity wage scale." The House failed to protect the workers; the Senate failed to protect them; and here we are now simply wasting time over nothing. Therefore, I shall protest against this condition and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. BOILEAU].

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, I am of the opinion, as is the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARCANTONIO], that the Congress should have approved the prevailing wage scale provision and put it into this joint resolution. I realize, however, that it is futile now to expect that we can incorporate such a provision in the joint resolution. The enactment of the joint resolution with the amendments that have been attached to it by the Senate will greatly aid not only labor but all of the people of the country. We should adopt this resolution without any delay, and I favor a motion to concur in the Senate amendments as soon as possible, and thereby make this money available at the earliest possible date. I believe it is our responsibility here to accept these Senate amendments. Therefore I am opposed to this rule, so that we may have an opportunity to concur in the Senate amendments and pass the joint resolution as it has been sent to us by the Senate.

I am in favor of the silver amendment. I believe that it has a great deal of merit. During the consideration of this joint resolution the House had very little time to debate its provisions. The Senate, however, has taken a good deal of time to deliberate on the various proposals, and in my humble judgment the resolution in its present form is as good as we liberals of this House can hope for, and I sincerely hope that we will vote down the previous question, so that we can amend the rule and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I agree that there has been a considerable amount of shadow boxing about this bill placing the control of \$4,800,000,000 in the hands of the President. No one has discussed the fundamental objection to the bill; that is, the destruction of representative government and the abdication of the control of the purse strings by Congress, and turning it over to the President. I am opposed to the bill from beginning to end. I am opposed to it on principle. It amounts to a change in our form of government without the consent of the governed. We deliberately propose by our votes to turn over the control of appropriations, the main power of the Congress, to the President of the United States. It makes no difference what kind of a President he is, good, bad, or indifferent, you set up an autocrat, a superman, at

the head of this Government in defiance of the Constitution and the coordinate and separate powers established by the Constitution.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FISH. No. I am sorry, but I cannot yield.

The Senator from Michigan stated that those who were responsible for this bill should be hanged. Now, that is a little harsh. I do not want to see the authors of this bill hanged. That is a little too harsh treatment, but at least we ought to consider deporting the authors of the bill to Fascist Italy, to Nazi Germany, or to communistic Soviet Russia, where they have autocratic governments. This bill destroys the fundamental principles of our Government without the consent of the governed, and if the sponsors of this surrender of legislative power want an autocratic form of government, let them go elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it is of little consequence to me, feeling as I do and being opposed to the general principle of the bill that delegates the powers of Congress to the President, whether this rule is voted up or whether it is voted down. Let us look at the record. Just 2 months ago this bill was brought in under a vicious and drastic rule. You Members on the majority side were told to support the bill like rubber stamps; you were given 48 hours to vote for this bill under a rigid gag rule, and were informed that unless you did millions of Americans would starve to death. What a travesty, what a mockery of representative government in the House of Representatives. Two months have gone by, and in spite of what was told you then by your own leaders, that it was necessary to pass it without amendment or debate, it has not yet been enacted into law. We told you then that the bill would be kicked full of holes in the Senate, and that you would not recognize it when it came back; that you would not recognize your own baby. The bill is back, and it is not recognizable at all. The only thing retained in it is the vicious principle of turning over the control of the purse strings to the President. But in spite of that, you acted as you were ordered, and made a laughing-stock of the House of Representatives and voted yourselves as nothing more nor less than a rubber stamp when you voted to strip yourself of your own legislative functions at the dictation of the White House and under the spur of patronage and the lash of Postmaster General Farley.

Mr. Speaker, I admit I am in a predicament. I am not in favor of inflation; but, on the other hand, I am in favor of the House of Representatives voting down gag rules and considering bills on their merits. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ].

Mr. MORITZ. Mr. Speaker, if you will look at the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of last Saturday and analyze the proceedings of the Senate when they passed this bill, you will then see with what trickery it was done. Three of the five Members of the Senate who have been put on this conference committee are against the passage of this bill. It was a trick. It would be a good thing for us to vote so that the amendments will stick, to fool them at their own trick. That is all they tried to do. They passed the Thomas amendment without a vote, as if to say, "We will pass it, but afterward we will cut its head off." Now let us pass this bill without the amendments as they are. I am against this rule.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MORITZ] has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE. Mr. Speaker, very much is being said about inflation. I think if we study the results of the increase in currency in this country we would see that a steady increase of the volume of money put into circulation is absolutely necessary to conduct business and to maintain the price level. The effect of increasing the volume of money in circulation, commonly referred to as "inflation", has been conclusively demonstrated in the past history of this coun-

try. Let me refer you to Senate Document No. 210, containing the minutes of a meeting of the Federal Reserve Board on May 18, 1920, and the statement made to the Board by Governor W. P. G. Harding at that time, when he pointed out that as a result of an increase of \$1,900,000,000 put into circulation in the period between 1914 and 1920 we had an expansion of \$11,000,000,000 in credit and we had an increase in the price of commodities of 25 percent and a decrease in production. If there is anything that this Government is trying to do, it is to increase prices and decrease production. If there is anything that is necessary to the restoration of prosperity in this country, it is a rise in the price level, both in property values and commodity prices. To do this we must meet the money needs of the people by adopting a plan that will supply a flow of new money into the channels of trade to keep pace with the increase of population and the growth of business. The issuance of silver certificates, authorized by the bill we are considering, is a safe and sound plan to meet this necessity by controlled inflation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER].

Mr. OLIVER. Mr. Speaker, this rule is not an extraordinary rule. It is simply intended to follow the usual course where differences arise between the House and the Senate. It is not unusual for the House to delegate authority to a limited number of its Members, representing the committees of the House, to try to iron out differences between the House and the Senate.

The Chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has called your attention to the fact that some of the amendments which were put on are not, in his judgment, workable. I am sure that those who are opposing the rule, some of those who spoke first, have not carefully examined the amendments, and they are not now prepared to discuss before the House the different amendments which have been put on by the Senate, in order to meet the objections suggested by the chairman of the committee.

In other words, some of my good friends who are usually so frank and so very candid have not, in fact, discussed the real objections they have to the rule now under consideration. Their objective is based on one amendment they are deeply interested in, and they are prepared to discuss everything in order to get that.

If the conferees should bring back a report that a majority of the House feel is unwise and not in conformity with their wishes, then you have full authority to vote down the conference report. This is not unusual; you have done it within the last few years, I know.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. Not now; my time is too short.

I do want to give this information since the gentleman from Texas called attention to it and it seems to have been urged as an argument in opposition to the rule. I refer to amendment 25, found on page 14, section 13, relating to public schools. It has been argued that there is great danger if you do not at once concur in the Senate's action that the schools may be affected adversely. The Senate in writing this amendment did not require a single dollar to be spent for schools. Read it and you will find it is left entirely to the discretion of the President and a definite limitation is placed on the amount that may be spent. As the chairman said, all the conferees are interested in caring for the emergency needs of public schools, and we will probably improve the amendment inserted by the Senate. I only call your attention to this to show that often when an argument is advanced purely for the purpose of registering an objection it goes too far.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. OLIVER. I yield.

Mr. BUCHANAN. Under the Senate amendment to the bill with respect to schools only \$40,000,000 could be allocated to schools.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

Mr. BUCHANAN. But we are contemplating amending the Senate amendment in such a way as to make \$300,000,000 available to schools.

Mr. OLIVER. Yes.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania if he has any time remaining?

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR].

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how the time stands now?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York has 12 minutes with the time yielded by the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RANKIN. And this exhausts the time?

The SPEAKER. This exhausts the time.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, this rule has been called a "gag" rule of various types, such as a "vicious gag rule", as the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] has declaimed. I maintain it is not a "gag" rule, and I say this earnestly. It is not an unusual rule, and it does not provide for unusual procedure in this House.

The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] spoke of the last clause in the rule, which provides that the managers on the part of the House are given specific authority to agree or disagree with any amendment on the part of the Senate—and I emphasize the word "disagree" with any amendment—which violates clause 2 of rule XX. Clause 2 of rule XX provides, in effect, that if an amendment of the Senate to a general appropriation bill—and this House Joint Resolution 117 is not a general appropriation bill—violates clause 2 of rule XXI, which prohibits legislation on an appropriation bill, and no amendment of the Senate providing for an appropriation upon any bill other than a general appropriation bill shall be agreed to by the House managers unless a separate vote is just taken on said amendment.

This last clause of this rule meets that situation. House Joint Resolution 117 is not a general appropriation bill. In effect, it is not an appropriation bill at all, but a house joint resolution providing for relief measures, to put 3,500,000 men back to work. Those thirty-odd amendments of the Senate, many of which may come within that category, could not be agreed to or disagreed to by the House managers without that specific authority.

There has been some confusion here, but it was partially cleared up by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] when he stated, in effect, that we are in the same position today, and in no different position than we shall be in when the conference report comes back to us. If a sufficient number of Members here do not agree to the conference report, which represents the action on the part of the conferees, our managers, the House can vote down the conference report and then vote on any amendment to which our conferees agreed or disagreed.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would rather complete my statement. Then I shall be glad to yield if I have time.

Ordinarily when a House bill comes back with Senate amendments there are four methods of procedure: One is that the bill can be referred to the committee which originated it, in this instance the Committee on Appropriations. Do those Members who have expressed such tearful sympathy with the possibility of the cessation of the C. C. C. camps, and who use that argument for quick action on this bill, want the bill sent to the Appropriations Committee? Do they want it considered by that committee almost as an original bill and then have it considered in the Committee of the Whole? The usual method, the normal method, the method used 999 times out of 1,000, is to send the bill directly to conference by unanimous consent when it comes back to the House with Senate amendments; that is almost an invariable rule, and that is what this special rule, so called, does. In the face of objection to unanimous consent, such a result could not happen without a special rule. Moreover, a special rule would be necessary that this bill be referred

back to the Appropriations Committee. So we are proceeding in the orderly way—the usual way—in this House when we propose this rule.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. When I get through, if the gentleman please.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman is wrong in that statement.

Mr. O'CONNOR. No; I am sure I am not wrong about it. This is not a general appropriation bill and has no privileged status in this House. It has no more privileged status than though it were a bill which came from one of the standing legislative committees, a bill which did not involve appropriation or the raising of revenue.

Mr. Speaker, we are faced with the practical situation of how most expeditiously, in accordance with the orderly procedure of this House, to handle this joint resolution for relief.

Some of us who are supporting this rule are most sympathetic with some of these amendments.

Some of us have always welcomed a chance to vote for the proper recognition of silver, and if that matter came up in an orderly way some of us would feel inclined to support such a measure. If the proposal came out of the standing committee which has jurisdiction of legislation relating to silver, some of us would support it. If the measure came in even as an amendment to a general appropriation bill, some of us would feel inclined to support it, but the silver legislation has no place in this measure. House Joint Resolution 117 is a relief measure wholly and entirely. That is why we want to proceed in an orderly way in reference to this matter.

Mr. Speaker, something has been said about the "dignity" of the House of Representatives, and how it has fallen from its high pedestal. Let me say, after due deliberation, that the House of Representatives may well take pride in the fact that it can legislate orderly and expeditiously. [Applause.] This rule is proposed for that very purpose, and I, for one, do not intend to match demagoguery against demagoguery. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, this great House of Representatives can legislate expeditiously and more without the fear of any one man, whether he came by railroad train or airplane, or without the fear of any one group. We legislate in this House by a majority, and that majority can always express the will of this House. No rule from the Rules Committee can ever deprive the majority of this right.

This House must function, and it must legislate irrespective of any individual or any group, short of a majority. I for one am willing to match the method of procedure in this body as against another body. We do not rush things through to get under the wire before somebody returns to town. [Laughter and applause.] When we are faced with amendments put on a House bill that are not put on with sincerity or with any hope or expectation that they would ever stick in the bill, we, as a parliamentary body, are compelled to face that situation, and keep our feet on the floor and not be swept off our foundation by any one man or by any minority.

We have been told here today that if we pass this rule there will be a filibuster in another body, which will occupy weeks. Why, there has been an unwarranted and a disgraceful filibuster there already for nearly 2 months. We are always able to handle filibusters in this body. We are proud of that fact.

Mr. Speaker, this rule is a test of not yielding to another body, of not yielding to one man or to a small group of men in another body. This rule is the real test of maintaining the dignity of our own body. We have not lost that dignity. This rule is a test of maintaining our own dignity and maintaining the right to conduct our parliamentary deliberations in an orderly, respectable, and dignified manner. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the previous question.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 265, nays 108, answered "present" 1, not voting 57, as follows:

[Roll No. 36]

YEAS—265

Andresen	Ditter	Kennedy, N. Y.	Reed, N. Y.
Andrew, Mass.	Dobbins	Kenney	Reilly
Arnold	Dondero	Kimball	Rich
Ashbrook	Dorsey	Klinzer	Richardson
Barden	Doughton	Kloeb	Robertson
Beam	Doxey	Kocialkowski	Rogers, Mass.
Beiter	Drewry	Kramer	Rogers, N. H.
Bell	Driscoll	Lambeth	Romjue
Berlin	Driver	Lanham	Rudd
Biermann	Duffey, Ohio	Larrabee	Russell
Blackney	Duffy, N. Y.	Lea, Calif.	Ryan
Bland	Eaton	Lehlbach	Sadowski
Blanton	Eckert	Lewis, Colo.	Sanders, La.
Bloom	Edmiston	Lewis, Md.	Sandlin
Boehne	Ekwall	Lloyd	Schuetz
Boland	Ellenbogen	Lord	Sears
Boylan	Engel	Lucas	Secrest
Brennan	Evans	Ludlow	Shanley
Brewster	Fenerty	McAndrews	Sisson
Brooks	Fiesinger	McCormack	Smith, Conn.
Brown, Ga.	Fish	McGrath	Smith, Va.
Brown, Mich.	Fitzpatrick	McLaughlin	Snyder
Brunner	Flannagan	McMillan	Spence
Buchanan	Focht	McReynolds	Stack
Buck	Ford, Calif.	Mahon	Starnes
Buckbee	Frey	Mansfield	Steagall
Buckley, N. Y.	Fuller	Mapes	Stubbs
Bulwinkle	Fulmer	Marshall	Sullivan
Burch	Gavagan	Martin, Mass.	Summers, Tex.
Burnham	Gearhart	Mason	Sutphin
Caldwell	Gifford	Mead	Taber
Carden	Gildea	Merritt, Conn.	Tarver
Carlson	Gillette	Merritt, N. Y.	Taylor, S. C.
Carmichael	Gingery	Michener	Terry
Carter	Goldsborough	Millard	Thom
Cary	Goodwin	Mitchell, Ill.	Thomas
Casey	Gray, Pa.	Montague	Thomason
Castellow	Green	Montet	Thompson
Celler	Gregory	Mott	Thurston
Chandler	Guyer	Nelson	Tinkham
Chapman	Gwynne	O'Brien	Tolan
Christianson	Haines	O'Connell	Tonry
Church	Halleck	O'Connor	Turner
Citron	Hamlin	O'Day	Umstead
Claborn	Hancock, N. Y.	O'Leary	Vinson, Ga.
Clark, N. C.	Harlan	Oliver	Vinson, Ky.
Cochran	Hart	O'Neal	Wadsworth
Cole, Md.	Harter	Owen	Walter
Cole, N. Y.	Hartley	Palmisano	Warren
Colmer	Hennings	Parks	Weaver
Cooley	Higgins, Conn.	Parsons	Welch
Cooper, Ohio	Higgins, Mass.	Patton	West
Cooper, Tenn.	Hill, Ala.	Pearson	Whichel
Corning	Hobbs	Perkins	Whittington
Costello	Hoffman	Peterson, Fla.	Wigglesworth
Cox	Holmes	Peterson, Ga.	Wilcox
Cravens	Hope	Pettengill	Williams
Crowe	Huddleston	Pfeifer	Wilson, La.
Culkin	Igoe	Plumley	Wilson, Pa.
Cullen	Imhoff	Polk	Wolcott
Daly	Jacobsen	Powers	Wolfenden
Darden	Jenckes, Ind.	Ramsay	Woodruff
Darrow	Jenkins, Ohio	Ramspeck	Woodrum
Delaney	Johnson, Tex.	Ransley	Zimmerman
Dempsey	Jones	Rayburn	
Dietrich	Kee	Reece	
Dingell	Kelly	Reed, Ill.	

NAYS—108

Amle	Faddis	Luckey	Robinson, Utah
Ayers	Fernandez	Lundeen	Rogers, Okla.
Bacharach	Fletcher	McClellan	Sanders, Tex.
Binderup	Ford, Miss.	McFarlane	Sauthoff
Bolleau	Gasque	McGroarty	Schneider
Burdick	Gassaway	McLeod	Scott
Cannon, Mo.	Gehrmann	Maas	Scrugham
Carpenter	Gilchrist	Maloney	Short
Cartwright	Gray, Ind.	Martín, Colo.	Sirovich
Clark, Idaho	Greenway	Massingale	Smith, Wash.
Coffee	Greever	Maverick	South
Colden	Hancock, N. C.	May	Stefan
Collins	Hildebrandt	Miller	Sweeney
Connery	Hill, Knute	Mitchell, Tenn.	Taylor, Colo.
Crawford	Hill, Samuel B.	Monaghan	Taylor, Tenn.
Cross, Tex.	Hoepfel	Moran	Tobey
Crosser, Ohio	Hook	Moritz	Turpin
Cummings	Houston	Murdock	Utterback
Deen	Hull	Nichols	Wallgren
Dies	Johnson, Okla.	O'Malley	Wearin
Dirksen	Keller	Patman	Werner
Disney	Kerr	Patterson	White
Dockweiler	Kniffin	Pierce	Withrow
Duncan	Knutson	Pittenger	Wolverton
Eagle	Lambertson	Randolph	Wood
Eicher	Lee, Okla.	Rankin	Young
	Lemke	Richards	Zioncheck

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—57

Adair	Dunn, Miss.	Kleberg	Sabath
Allen	Dunn, Pa.	Kopplemann	Schaefer
Andrews, N. Y.	Englebright	Kvale	Schulte
Arends	Farley	Lamneck	Seger
Bacon	Ferguson	Lesinski	Shannon
Bankhead	Gambrill	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Bolton	Granfield	McKeough	Snell
Cannon, Wls.	Greenwood	McLean	Somers, N. Y.
Cavichia	Griswold	McSwain	Stewart
Crosby	Healey	Meeks	Treadway
Crowther	Hess	Norton	Truax
Dear	Hollister	Peyser	Underwood
DeRouen	Johnson, W. Va.	Quinn	
Dickstein	Kahn	Rabaut	
Doutrich	Kennedy, Md.	Robison, Ky.	

So the previous question was ordered.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess (for) with Mr. Ferguson (against).
Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Truax (against).

General pairs:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. McLean.
Mrs. Norton with Mr. Treadway.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bacon.
Mr. Gambrill with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
Mr. Sabath with Mrs. Kahn.
Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Englebright.
Mr. Schulte with Mr. Cavichia.
Mr. Healey with Mr. Kvale.
Mr. Shannon with Mr. Arends.
Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Dear.
Mr. Adair with Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania.
Mr. Crosby with Mr. Farley.
Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. McGehee.
Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Quinn.
Mr. McKeough with Mr. Meeks.
Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
Mr. Peyser with Mr. Rabaut.

Mr. CHURCH, Mr. HIGGINS of Massachusetts, and Mr. FOCHT changed their votes from "nay" to "yea."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. ELLENBOGEN). The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Sixty-four Members have risen; not a sufficient number.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I challenge the count.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may state that according to the roll call there were 371 Members present. It is very evident that the number who arose was not one-fifth of the number present as shown by the roll call.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I counted 70 myself.

The SPEAKER. It would take more than 70 to order the yeas and nays.

So the yeas and nays were refused.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for tellers.

Tellers were ordered; and the Chair appointed as tellers the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR] and the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Do I understand the teller vote is taken on the passage of the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is correct.

The House divided; and the tellers reported that there were—ayes 186, noes 78.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order we were entitled to a roll-call vote, because this vote shows there are not five times as many Members in the House as stood up a while ago and asked for a roll-call vote.

The SPEAKER. By the gentleman's own count of 70, he was not entitled to a roll-call vote, because it requires 75, according to the roll call which has just been completed.

Mr. RANKIN. I beg the Chair's pardon; what was the report?

The SPEAKER. This vote was on an entirely different question, and the Chair has no doubt but what many Members have gone to their offices since the roll call was completed.

Mr. RANKIN. No; Mr. Speaker, many Members have come in since then.

The regular order was demanded.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McFARLANE. Is there any way by which we can get a roll-call vote at this time?

The SPEAKER. The House has refused a roll-call vote on the passage of the resolution.

So the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, is it possible to have a roll-call vote on the basis of the number of Members present, as indicated by the teller vote, if one-fifth of the number shown by the teller vote would now ask for a roll-call vote?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will state to the gentleman that quite a number of minutes—15 or 20, or perhaps one-half an hour—has elapsed since the House refused the roll call, and that roll call was requested immediately after a roll call of the House which disclosed 371 Members present. It therefore took 75 Members to order a roll call, and according to the count there were not 75 Members standing.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi did not vote in the majority and cannot make that motion.

Mr. Speaker, I move to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to and to lay that motion on the table.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand that the question be divided.

Mr. McFARLANE. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BOILEAU. Mr. Speaker, is this a vote on tabling the motion to reconsider or on the motion to reconsider itself?

The SPEAKER. It is on tabling the motion to reconsider the vote by which the resolution was agreed to.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 263, nays 106, answered "present" 1, not voting 61, as follows:

[Roll No. 37]

YEAS—263

Andresen	Carlson	Dear	Fulmer
Andrew, Mass.	Carmichael	Delaney	Gavagan
Arnold	Carter	Dempsey	Gearhart
Ashbrook	Cary	Dietrich	Gifford
Barden	Castellow	Dingell	Gildea
Beam	Celler	Ditter	Gillette
Beiter	Chandler	Dobbins	Gingery
Bell	Chapman	Dondero	Goldsbrough
Berlin	Christianson	Dorsey	Goodwin
Biermann	Church	Doughton	Gray, Pa.
Blackney	Citron	Doxey	Green
Bland	Claiborne	Drewry	Gregory
Blanton	Clark, N. C.	Driscoll	Guyer
Bloom	Cochran	Driver	Gwynne
Boehne	Colden	Duffey, Ohio	Haines
Boland	Cole, Md.	Duffy, N. Y.	Halleck
Boylan	Cole, N. Y.	Eaton	Hamlin
Brennan	Colmer	Eckert	Hancock, N. Y.
Brewster	Cooley	Edmiston	Harlan
Brooks	Cooper, Ohio	Ekwall	Hart
Brown, Ga.	Cooper, Tenn.	Ellenbogen	Harter
Brown, Mich.	Corning	Engel	Hartley
Brunner	Costello	Evans	Hennings
Buchanan	Cox	Fenerty	Higgins, Conn.
Buck	Cravens	Fiesinger	Higgins, Mass.
Buckbee	Crawford	Fish	Hill, Ala.
Buckley, N. Y.	Crowe	Pitzpatrick	Hobbs
Bulwinkle	Culkin	Flannagan	Hoffman
Burch	Cullen	Focht	Holmes
Burnham	Daly	Ford, Calif.	Hope
Caldwell	Darden	Frey	Huddleston
Carden	Darrow	Fuller	Igoe

Imhoff
Jenckes, Ind.
Jenkins, Ohio
Johnson, Tex.
Jones
Kee
Kelly
Kennedy, N. Y.
Kenney
Kimball
Kinzer
Kloeb
Knutson
Kocialkowski
Kopplemann
Kramer
Lanham
Larrabee
Lehlbach
Lewis, Colo.
Lloyd
Lord
Lucas
Ludlow
McAndrews
McCormack
McGrath
McLaughlin
McMillan
McReynolds
Mahon
Mansfield
Mapes
Marshall

Martin, Mass.
Mason
Mead
Merritt, Conn.
Merritt, N. Y.
Michener
Millard
Mitchell, Ill.
Montague
Montet
Mott
Nelson
O'Brien
O'Connell
O'Connor
O'Day
O'Leary
Oliver
O'Neal
Owen
Palmisano
Parks
Parsons
Patton
Pearson
Peterson, Fla.
Peterson, Ga.
Pfeifer
Plumley
Polk
Powers
Ramsay
Ramspeck
Ransley

Rayburn
Reece
Reed, Ill.
Reed, N. Y.
Reilly
Rich
Richardson
Robertson
Rogers, Mass.
Rogers, N. H.
Romjue
Rudd
Russell
Ryan
Sanders, La.
Sandlin
Schuetz
Schulte
Sears
Secret
Shanley
Shannon
Sisson
Smith, Conn.
Smith, Va.
Snyder
Spence
Starnes
Steagall
Stubbs
Sullivan
Summers, Tex.
Sutphin
Taber

Tarver
Taylor, S. C.
Terry
Thom
Thomas
Thomason
Thompson
Tinkham
Tolan
Tomry
Treadway
Turner
Umstead
Vinson, Ga.
Vinson, Ky.
Wadsworth
Walter
Warren
Weaver
Welch
West
Whelchel
Whittington
Wigglesworth
Wilcox
Williams
Wilson, La.
Wilson, Pa.
Wolcott
Wolfenden
Woodruff
Woodrum
Zimmerman

NAYS—106

Amlie
Ayers
Bacharach
Binderup
Boileau
Buckler, Minn.
Burdick
Cannon, Mo.
Carpenter
Cartwright
Clark, Idaho
Coffee
Collins
Connery
Cross, Tex.
Cresser, Ohio
Cummings
Deen
Dies
Dirksen
Disney
Dockweiler
Duncan
Eagle
Eicher
Faddis
Fernandez

Fletcher
Ford, Miss.
Gasque
Gassaway
Gehrmann
Gilchrist
Gray, Ind.
Greenway
Hancock, N. C.
Hildebrandt
Hill, Knute
Hill, Samuel B.
Hoeppe
Hook
Houston
Hull
Jacobsen
Johnson, Okla.
Keller
Kerr
Kniffin
Lambertson
Lee, Okla.
Lemke
Luckey
Lundeon
McClellan

McFarlane
McGroarty
McLeod
Maas
Maloney
Martin, Colo.
Massingale
Maverick
May
Miller
Mitchell, Tenn.
Monaghan
Moran
Moritz
Murdock
Nichols
O'Malley
Patman
Patterson
Perkins
Pierce
Pittenger
Randolph
Rankin
Richards
Robinson, Utah
Rogers, Okla.

Sanders, Tex.
Sauthoff
Schneider
Scott
Scrugham
Short
Sirovich
Smith, Wash.
South
Stefan
Sweeney
Taylor, Colo.
Taylor, Tenn.
Tobey
Turpin
Utterback
Wallgren
Wearin
Werner
White
Withrow
Wolverton
Wood
Young
Zioncheck

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1

Marcantonio

NOT VOTING—61

Adair
Allen
Andrews, N. Y.
Arends
Bacon
Bankhead
Bolton
Cannon, Wis.
Casey
Caviechia
Cavichia
Hess
Crowther
DeRouen
Dickstein
Doutrich
Dunn, Miss.

Dunn, Pa.
Englebright
Farley
Ferguson
Gambrell
Granfield
Greenwood
Greever
Griswold
Healey
Hess
Hollister
Johnson, W. Va.
Kahn
Kennedy, Md.
Kleberg

Kvale
Lambeth
Lamneck
Lea, Calif.
Lesinski
Lewis, Md.
McGehee
McKeough
McLean
McSwain
Meeks
Norton
Pettengill
Peyser
Quinn
Rabaut

Robison, Ky.
Sabath
Sadowski
Schaefer
Seger
Smith, W. Va.
Snell
Somers, N. Y.
Stack
Stewart
Thurston
Truax
Underwood

So the motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The Clerk announced the following additional pairs:

On this vote:

Mr. Hess (for) with Mr. Ferguson (against).
Mr. Dickstein (for) with Mr. Truax (against).

Until further notice:

Mr. Bankhead with Mr. Snell.
Mr. Greenwood with Mr. Bolton.
Mr. Johnson of West Virginia with Mr. Crowther.
Mr. Lamneck with Mr. McLean.
Mr. McSwain with Mr. Allen.
Mr. Griswold with Mr. Hollister.
Mr. Underwood with Mr. Stewart.
Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Andrews of New York.
Mr. Granfield with Mr. Seger.
Mr. Smith of West Virginia with Mr. Bacon.
Mr. Gambrell with Mr. Doutrich.
Mr. DeRouen with Mr. Robison of Kentucky.
Mr. Sabath with Mrs. Kahn.

Mr. Schaefer with Mr. Engelbright.
 Mrs. Norton with Mr. Cavicchia.
 Mr. Healey with Mr. Kvale.
 Mr. Lambeth with Mr. Arends.
 Mr. Lea of California with Mr. Thurston.
 Mr. Adair with Mr. Dunn of Pennsylvania.
 Mr. Crosby with Mr. Farley.
 Mr. Kennedy of Maryland with Mr. McGehee.
 Mr. Lesinski with Mr. Quinn.
 Mr. McKeough with Mr. Meeks.
 Mr. Cannon of Wisconsin with Mr. Dunn of Mississippi.
 Mr. Peyser with Mr. Rabaut.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Greever.
 Mr. Lewis of Maryland with Mr. Casey.
 Mr. Stack with Mr. Pettengill.

Mr. AMLIE changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Mr. ANDRESEN changed his vote from "nay" to "yea."

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. GRANFIELD, and the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. HEALEY, are absent today on account of official business. If present, they would vote "yea" on this roll call.

Mr. BELL. Mr. Speaker, may the RECORD show that my colleague the gentleman from Missouri, Mr. SHANNON, is absent on account of serious illness, and I ask that he may be excused from attending sessions of the House for an indefinite period.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, my colleague the gentleman from New Jersey, Mrs. NORTON, is absent from the House on account of illness. If present, she would vote "yea" on this motion and "yea" on the passage of the resolution.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Chair appointed as conferees on the part of the House MESSRS. BUCHANAN, TAYLOR of Colorado, ARNOLD, OLIVER, TABER, and BACON.

THE CALIFORNIA-PACIFIC INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION AT SAN DIEGO

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the California-Pacific International Exposition, San Diego, Calif., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, reported by me on order of the Ways and Means Committee on yesterday.

The Clerk read the title of the joint resolution.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman explain this measure to the House? As I understand it, the resolution is the customary resolution insofar as expositions are concerned.

Mr. BUCK. The resolution is in the ordinary form, Mr. Speaker, which has been adopted by Congresses in the past, permitting exporters at this exposition to import articles under bond and without the payment of tariff duties at the time they are imported; but in the event that sales of any of the exhibits are made, the tariff duties must be paid in full to the United States Government.

The measure has a unanimous report from the Ways and Means Committee and it also has the approval of the Secretary of the Treasury.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I have no objection.

Mr. CONNERY. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentlemen on the Republican side why it is that yesterday, for instance, when something which was vital to labor came up under unanimous-consent request, they felt it their imperative duty to object, but today, with respect to another matter, there seems to be no objection. Why do they not say to these gentlemen today to let it go over until the Consent Calendar is called?

I am in favor of the gentleman's proposition, but I merely want to call this to the attention of the House. What is sauce for the goose ought to be sauce for the gander.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Does the gentleman want to object?

Mr. CONNERY. No; by no means. I would not object to any Member's getting consideration for something that is of benefit to his city or State, particularly if it is for labor, like I tried to do yesterday.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. I do not know anything about the gentleman's request. Who was it that objected to the gentleman's request yesterday?

Mr. CONNERY. The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH] and the Republican leader, the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CONNERY. I yield.

Mr. CULKIN. Is the gentleman trying to lead the labor of the country bodily into the Democratic Party?

Mr. CONNERY. No; not at all.

Mr. CULKIN. I do not think this position of the gentleman is very well taken.

Mr. CONNERY. I am just calling attention to something which happened on the floor of this House yesterday with respect to two matters which the Department of Labor and the Committee on Labor wanted considered.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded to read the joint resolution, which is as follows:

House Joint Resolution 174

*Resolved, etc., That all articles which shall be imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the international exposition to be held at San Diego, Calif., beginning in May 1935, by the California-Pacific International Exposition Co., or for use in constructing, installing, or maintaining foreign buildings or exhibits at the said exposition, upon which articles there shall be a tariff or customs duty, shall be admitted without payment of such tariff, customs duty, fees, or charges under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe; but it shall be lawful at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the said exposition, to sell within the area of the exposition any articles provided for herein, subject to such regulations for the security of the revenue and for the collection of import duties as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *Provided*, That all such articles, when withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, shall be subject to the duties, if any, imposed upon such articles by the revenue laws in force at the date of their withdrawal; and on such articles, which shall have suffered diminution or deterioration from incidental handling or exposure, the duties, if payable, shall be assessed according to the appraised value at the time of withdrawal from entry hereunder for consumption or entry under the general tariff law: *Provided further*, That imported articles provided for herein shall not be subject to any marking requirements of the general tariff laws, except when such articles are withdrawn for consumption or use in the United States, in which case they shall not be released from customs custody until properly marked, but no additional duty shall be assessed because such articles were not sufficiently marked when imported into the United States: *Provided further*, That at any time during or within 3 months after the close of the exposition, any article entered hereunder may be abandoned to the Government or destroyed under customs supervision, whereupon any duties on such article shall be remitted: *Provided further*, That articles, which have been admitted without payment of duty for exhibition under any tariff law and which have remained in continuous customs custody or under a customs exhibition bond, and imported articles in bonded warehouses under the general tariff law may be accorded the privilege of transfer to and entry for exhibition at the said exposition under such regulations as the Secretary of the Treasury shall prescribe: *And provided further*, That the California-Pacific International Exposition Co. shall be deemed, for customs purposes only, to be the sole consignee of all merchandise imported under the provisions of this act, and that the actual and necessary customs charges for labor, services, and other expenses in connection with the entry, examination, appraisal, release, or custody, together with the necessary charges for salaries of customs officers and employees in connection with the supervision, custody of, and accounting for, articles imported under the provisions of this act, shall be reimbursed by the California-Pacific International Exposition Co. to the Government of the United States under regulations to be prescribed by the Secretary of the Treasury, and that receipts from such reimbursements shall be deposited as refunds to the appropriation from which paid, in the manner provided for in section 524, Tariff Act of 1930.*

Mr. BUCK (interrupting the reading of the joint resolution). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the further reading of the resolution be dispensed with and that the resolution in its entirety be printed in the RECORD.

Mr. WOLCOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that on the Consent Calendar there are two bills, one authorizing the President to ask the foreign countries to participate in these expositions—

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, may I interrupt the gentleman to say that this joint resolution has nothing to do with the

bills on the Consent Calendar? This refers to the San Diego Exposition, for which we have already appropriated \$350,000 for a Government exhibit. The exposition opens on May 29, which is the reason for expediting this measure and calling it up out of order.

Mr. WOLCOTT. There are two bills on the Consent Calendar having to do with expositions, and I wondered how many exhibitions they are going to hold in California.

Mr. BUCK. Those bills refer to 1938, a long way ahead.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

The resolution was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 2 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

Mr. ARNOLD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen, I have asked for this time for the purpose of formally bringing before the House the petitions that were presented this morning on the east steps of the Capitol by Michael F. Shannon, grand exalted ruler of the Benevolent Protective Order of Elks.

This formal presentation ceremony took place at 11 o'clock this morning, and they were received by the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House in behalf of their respective bodies.

These petitions contain something like a million names of representative citizens throughout the country. They are designed to bring to the attention of the Congress a program intended to combat as far as possible the sinister influences at work throughout the country that are seeking by force and violence or other unlawful means the overthrow of the Government.

I do this because it is necessary, as I understand it, to bring the matter in some way formally before the House. The petitions, I assume, will be referred by the Speaker to the proper committee. I do not know what committee has jurisdiction, but I presume it is the Committee on the Judiciary of the House. The purposes set forth in these petitions are as follows:

First. Empower the Bureau of Investigation of the Department of Justice to investigate all subversive activities of individuals and organizations, alien or otherwise, seeking or planning the overthrow of our Government by force or violence or other unlawful means and to employ the usual investigational methods therefor. The Department of Justice should also be charged with the discretionary authority of publication of the truth about organizations and individuals engaged in subversive activities and supplied with sufficient funds and personnel to carry on the foregoing.

Second. Declare organizations which advocate the overthrow by force and violence of our Government to be illegal organizations and prohibit their existence in any territory under the jurisdiction of the United States.

Third. Declare it a felony for an individual to publicly or secretly advocate, promote, or encourage the overthrow or change of our form of government by force and violence, or to knowingly belong to any society, association, group, or organization which has for its object or one of its objects the advocacy or furtherance of the overthrow of the Government of the United States by force and violence or any unlawful means.

Fourth. Effectively close the United States mails to newspapers or other publications advocating, encouraging, or affiliated with any organization advocating or encouraging the overthrow of Government by force and violence.

Fifth. Prohibit the interstate transportation of newspapers or other publications advocating, encouraging, or affiliated with any organization advocating or encouraging the overthrow of Government by force and violence.

Sixth. Make clear the laws for the deportation of all aliens advocating the overthrow or change of our system of government by force and violence and make certain the impounding without bail of any such aliens pending deportation.

Seventh. Prohibit the entry into the United States of any individual who is known to advocate the overthrow or change of government by force or violence and clarify the law so that there can be no conflict of authority between departments of our Government in the execution of this law or regulations made under it.

Elighth. Provide for the revocation of the naturalization of any naturalized citizen who advocates the overthrow of our Government by force or violence.

This is a most worthy undertaking by this great fraternal order, and I think the House should know of the formal presentation and reception of these petitions, which are designed to impress upon the country and the Congress these evil influences at work in this country and to combat them as much as possible. [Applause.]

THE BONUS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent, provided it is not inserted in the RECORD by the Senate, to insert in the RECORD an address delivered over the radio by Senator TYDINGS, of Maryland.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

(The matter referred to is printed in the RECORD by request of Hon. HENRY F. ASHURST, of Arizona, p. 4426.)

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the close of business on the Speaker's table tomorrow morning I may be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table tomorrow he be permitted to address the House for 25 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the right to object. It has been the custom of the House not to allow long speeches where we have bills before us.

Mr. HARLAN. Does the gentleman expect to proceed with the naval appropriation bill tomorrow?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I think so.

Mr. HARLAN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman thinks that will interfere with his program, I withdraw the request.

FRIENDLY NATIONS

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Minister of the Irish Free State.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KENNEY. Mr. Speaker, under the leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I include the following international radio address by the Honorable Michael MacWhite, Minister of the Irish Free State, delivered on St. Patrick's Day, March 17, 1935:

In the document which St. Patrick called his "confession", he tells of a vision he had in the night in which he saw a man coming, as it were, from Ireland with countless letters. And this man, he adds, "gave me one of them, and I read the beginning of the letter, which was entitled 'The Voice of the Irish', and while I was reading aloud the beginning of the letter, I thought that at that very moment I heard the voice of them who lived beside the Wood of Foelut, which is high unto the western sea."

Today the voice of the Irish is heard in all the lands that are watered by the seven seas, and through the courtesy of the American Irish Historical Society, which is vitally interested in everything affecting the two countries, some voices from this great Republic of the west are carrying to Ireland messages of esteem, friendship, and admiration. It was because St. Patrick devoted himself so valiantly and so whole-heartedly to the summons which came to him in the Voice of the Irish that today his feast has become a day of celebration, not for the Irish alone but for practically the people of all the countries in the world.

As the official representative of the Irish Government in the United States, it is a source of perpetual wonder and gratification to me to note the manner in which this day is observed by the American people. In every street in every one of the great cities, and in every town and village, the shop windows display some emblem or some objects that are reminiscent of Ireland.

There is no newspaper in any quarter of the country this week without reference to St. Patrick, and all these notices and references are of such a kind as to impress on one the belief that the generous people of America, whatever be their politics or religion, give to St. Patrick the same measure of devotion and veneration that they would if the voice that called him 1,500 years ago had come from high unto this western sea. Today in hundreds of halls and banquet rooms people gather to honor St. Patrick and to listen to orators, who tell them of his glories and achievements and of the glories and achievements of the Irish

race. The flag of Ireland flies side by side with the Stars and Stripes, and speakers and listeners alike rejoice in the conviction that in honoring St. Patrick they are at the same time expressing their devotion to the principles and purposes of which the United States has become the embodiment.

It would be no exaggeration on my part to say that the homage paid to our patron saint in this country would be a revelation to our people at home. The green favors displayed in New York alone, if joined together, would easily reach to Ireland and back again. It cannot be denied that St. Patrick is America's best venerated saint, and who can venerate St. Patrick without at the same time loving the land he made his own?

In America today the children of St. Patrick play a prominent part in public life. In church and state, in commerce and industry, in science and literature, Irish names are becoming increasingly numerous toward the top. Descendants of Irish immigrants are numerically greater in the Congress of the United States today than at any time in American history. The loyalty of American citizens of Irish origin has never been questioned. Many years ago John Randolph, of Roanoke, a great American patriot, said, "I have seen a white crow and heard of black swans, but an Irish opponent of American liberty I never either saw or heard of."

The bonds which unite the people of Ireland and the people of the United States are not of yesterday. These bonds were knit during the heroic days when America was engaged in the Revolution, and of which this great Republic rose to the full status of Nationhood. One of the first messages of the Continental Congress in 1775 was addressed to the Irish people thanking them for their friendliness to the rights of mankind and acknowledging the fact that the Irish nation had produced patriots who had already "distinguished themselves in the cause of humanity and of America."

The spirit of complete understanding of American aims, of friendship and of sympathy which led thousands of Irishmen to take their places beside the struggling patriots of the Colonies, and to make a willing sacrifice of their lives that American democracy might be born, has remained unimpaired by the passing of years. Ireland and America are now one in spirit as they were then. The fervor of patriotism is no stronger in one than in the other and both are animated by the same high resolve that government of the people in any country of the world shall be by the people of that country and that democracy shall not perish from the earth.

There is a union of minds and souls between the people of the two countries that can never be broken by suspicion, rivalry, or the lust for conquest. This union is closer than any that could be established by the tenuous threads of diplomacy and too strong to be rent by the designs of international intrigue. The celebration of St. Patrick's Day, year by year, tends to bring the two countries into closer and more intimate relations and to solidify the friendship that already exists into something stronger and more enduring. No one who has the opportunity to listen to the men who are called upon to speak at the celebrations in honor of St. Patrick can escape the conviction that the American mind has a clear grasp of the place which Ireland now holds and will increasingly hold in the affairs of the world. Peace for Europe and, perhaps, for the entire world will be assured when the feeling of Ireland for America will spread eastward to other countries, and when it will not be necessary to think of international relations in terms of bombing planes, poison gases, bombproof shelters, fortresses, and vessels of war. The voice of Ireland may in the future call again to Europe and under Divine Providence it may awake in it the spirit of St. Patrick and the day may come when the entire world will be united in a common purpose as unselfish and noble as that which makes of St. Patrick's Day a world-wide festival.

It is in this spirit I wish to convey to the people of Ireland today the fraternal greetings of their myriad of friends in the United States and to the people of America the assurance of our all-abiding friendship and good will.

DEPORTATION OF JOHN STRACHEY

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a copy of a letter which I have written.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AMLIE. Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent granted me, I am herewith presenting a copy of a letter that I have written to the Commissioner of Immigration in protest against the deportation proceedings that have been instituted against John Strachey, a British subject:

MARCH 25, 1935.

Col. DANIEL W. MACCORMACK,
Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization,
Department of Labor.

DEAR COLONEL MACCORMACK: This letter is written for the purpose of protesting against the action of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization in ordering the arrest and deportation of Mr. John Strachey, Marxian author, who is now lecturing in the United States.

I realize that it may not be politic, but I feel that it is my duty to make such a protest. There are greater issues involved in this case than the mere deportation of an English subject.

In the first place, I want to state candidly that in my opinion this action on the part of the Commissioner of Immigration has been brought about through the influence of powerful and sinister forces at work in this country today.

Newspapers which have come to my desk indicate that reactionary local business interests have sought to prevent Mr. Strachey from speaking in various parts of the country. The San Francisco Chronicle for February 4, 1935, contains an editorial entitled "Intolerance usually defeats its own end." It goes on to say:

"The Los Angeles custom has been for one group to determine what speakers other groups should be permitted to hear. The method is to use pressure on owners of halls to refuse to rent them to organizations wishing to listen to addresses to which the suppression groups object. Now, for the first time the same thing has happened in San Francisco."

The editorial goes on to state that a branch of the League of Women Voters of San Francisco had invited Mr. John Strachey to give a lecture to this group. The editorial goes on to say:

"Now, we submit that it is the business of these excellent and responsible women, and nobody else, whom they wish to hear. Many of them are intelligent conservatives—but not stupid ones like those who would forbid them to hear an explanation of the radical movement from its most brilliant living exponent."

Apparently, however, these reactionary business interests have not succeeded as well as they had wished by these bludgeoning tactics and are now seeking to use the Office of the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization.

I believe that I am using this expression advisedly. Not long ago it came to my attention that a super-reactionary organization of big business men had raised a campaign fund of almost a million dollars for the purpose of carrying out their program.

I have learned from personal observation that when organizations capable of raising money in such sums decide to strike, they do not strike from the bottom but directly from the top.

A local newspaper carried a news item last week in which the Secretary of Labor was quoted to the effect that she would have nothing to do with this matter.

I do not know what the regular order of business may be within the Department of Labor, but I do know that the decision to arrest Mr. Strachey and order his deportation was one of far-reaching consequence. It was known that the order for the arrest and deportation of Mr. Strachey was one of far-reaching consequence before it was issued, and it was a decision of the kind that should not have been made at least without the authorization of the Secretary of Labor.

I feel that I can properly protest in this matter without the danger of being classed as a Communist. Mr. Strachey about a year ago in an article in the January issue of the American Mercury paid me the doubtful compliment of comparing my ideas with those of Adolf Hitler. I, in turn, do not feel that his notion of a social program based on the theory of the class struggle has any particular validity in the United States.

To forestall a lengthy legal brief from your office, I might say that I also realize that Mr. Strachey, an English subject, has no civil rights under the Constitution of the United States. Nevertheless this country, as well as England, has well-established traditions of free speech. These traditions are well stated in the opinions of the late Justice Holmes. The great justice is hardly in his grave before a determined effort is made to disregard these traditions and set them aside.

There is a wide-spread effort in this country today to make people believe that our democratic institutions are threatened by radicals who "predict that capitalism is doomed and that the alternative is certain to be fascism or communism." In order to save the right of free speech the exponents of this position propose to abolish freedom of speech for the time being.

I want to say that thinking people today generally realize that the democratic institutions of this country cannot long endure with 20 percent of the people on poor relief and another 20 percent self-sustaining but without income, while at the same time 1 percent of the people at the top of the social pyramid own 60 percent of the Nation's wealth. In 1929 one-tenth of 1 percent of the people of the United States had an income as great as the total income of 47,000,000 people at the bottom of the social pyramid.

I need not tell you that a great many eminently conservative people of wealth in the United States realize fully the implication of what is happening to the capitalist system throughout the world. These men were discussing, even while Mr. Hoover was still President, the possible necessity for a right-wing dictatorship in order to maintain their vested interests. I think this fact was well brought out by the testimony of Gen. Smedley Butler a few months ago before the Dickstein Committee.

It is my opinion that the great concentration of wealth and income on the one hand and the great technological capacity of the country on the other have created difficulties which cannot be solved without a complete reorganization of our economic system.

I believe it is the duty of every intelligent American at this time to try to secure all the enlightenment possible on the nature of our economic system and the manner in which it operates. I believe that an understanding of our economic difficulties necessarily requires familiarity with the teachings of Adam Smith and the classical economists, with the teachings of Karl Marx and his followers, with the work of Thorstein Veblen and the Technocrats, and with the various statistical material made available by research organizations and by the various departments of the United States Government.

Many responsible persons have come to the conclusion that the economic system under which we operate in the United States,

commonly known as "capitalism", is rapidly approaching the end of the period when it will work. After all, it does not constitute an effort to overthrow the Government or incite to violence merely to come to the conclusion that the capitalist system is doomed, and to state one's opinion to this effect. Certainly this is not a crime in the United States or England, although, of course, it is criminal to make such a statement in Italy or Germany.

I notice by the newspapers that Prof. Harold Laski, of the London School of Economics, is to speak in New York City next week. In my humble opinion Professor Laski is the most intelligent and competent political observer in the world today. I have not read his latest book, but from certain reviews which have appeared in the press I would be led to infer that Professor Laski has come to very much the same conclusions that have been reached by Mr. Strachey.

The difference between the two, as I see it, is that Mr. Strachey has come to the conclusion that capitalism is doomed, that it is not worth saving, and that the alternative is communism, to be achieved by the instrument of the class struggle; which program he has accepted with enthusiasm.

Professor Laski has apparently come to the same conclusion about the ultimate fate of capitalism. The book reviews indicate that in his last book Professor Laski feels the people will not be given opportunity to gain political control through democratic action. He seems to feel that the capitalists will impose a dictatorship before the people have an opportunity to gain political control. If this should occur, Mr. Laski and Mr. Strachey presumably would be agreed as to the nature of the weapon that remained at their disposal. Professor Laski comes to this conclusion not jubilantly but with profound sorrow.

If Mr. Strachey is to be deported, then it seems to me that the door is also open for the deportation of Mr. Laski. If Mr. Hearst should insist upon such deportation, I presume that your Department would obligingly comply.

If this treatment is to be accorded eminent subjects of foreign nations, the way is opened to deprive the average American citizen of his traditional rights. In fact, one need but read the program of the United States Chamber of Commerce and the bills which have already been introduced in Congress by the Hearstings to know that this is a part of the general plan and merely the beginning of a process which calls for the abandonment of the traditional American and English rights of freedom of speech. These bills would make it a crime for an American citizen to discuss and criticize the workings of the economic system, just as it is now a crime to do so in Germany and Italy.

In the name of America's best traditions, I wish to protest, Mr. Commissioner, against the action that you are taking.

Very sincerely yours,

THOMAS R. AMLIE.

BUTTER SUBSTITUTES

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CULKIN. Mr. Speaker, for several years past I have had a bill pending before the Committee on Agriculture of the House which, if passed, will prevent the manufacture and sale of butter substitutes in the United States. This bill has a threefold purpose. First, it will be a contribution to the health of the people of the United States, particularly the growing children of our land. Second, it will prevent a fraud in the manufacture and production of a necessary food. In the final instance, Mr. Speaker, it will aid 4,500,000 dairymen in America whose condition today is desperate. The A. A. A. has done nothing for the dairyman. It has, in fact, made his condition more grievous.

Two years ago I called the attention of the House to the fact that under the modern scheme of racketeering there was grave danger of the racketeer in the metropolitan areas relabeling and selling this counterfeit food as butter. I hold in my hand today a report from the assistant district attorney of the Federal district of Boston, in which he states that in 1934 there were shipped into the Boston area some 375,000 pounds of oleomargarine and butter substitutes, which were relabeled and sold as butter by the racketeers. I claim that that condition is general throughout the metropolitan areas of the United States. There are manufactured in the United States today some 250,000,000 pounds of this counterfeit food. A prosecution, ably conducted by Charles A. Rome, assistant United States attorney, of the Boston, Mass., district, under the direction of the present splendid Attorney General of the United States, brought 20 peddlers of bogus butter to justice. This brings the fact to light that while there are butter substitutes in the United States this counterfeit and fraud will be perpetrated upon the people of the United States. Canada, with only 10,000,000 people

and moderate in worldly goods, adopted this law 10 years ago. My bill is a counterpart of the Canadian legislation. The enactment of this legislation will protect the public health and will give economic succor to the long-suffering dairymen.

Possible objection to the bill on the part of American producers comes from the cottonseed-oil group. Some three or four hundred thousand dollars' worth of that product goes into the production of this synthetic butter. On the other hand, the dairymen of the United States are buying a hundred million dollars' worth of cottonseed products for feed for their cattle. The beef industry sells something like a million and a half dollars' worth of beef stearin for this product. With the buying power of the dairymen enhanced by the passage of this act, the beef industry will sell \$25,000,000 worth more beef to the dairymen. No other national group will be unfavorably affected by this bill.

Mr. Speaker, when this bill of mine comes from the committee, I bespeak the kindly consideration of this House for it. I repeat, it is in the interest of the health of the people of the United States and will give succor to 4,500,000 dairymen whom the A. A. A. and the administration have ignored.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CULKIN. Yes.

Mr. ANDRESEN. Does the gentleman's bill seek to eliminate the manufacture and sale of butter substitutes?

Mr. CULKIN. That is what it does. It is patterned after the Canadian law which has been in effect in that country for 10 years. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that business in order on Calendar Wednesday, tomorrow, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 172.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Resolution 172

Resolved, That rule XXIV of the House of Representatives be, and is hereby, amended by striking out paragraph 6 thereof and inserting in lieu thereof the following:

"6. On the first Tuesday of each month after disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker shall direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar. Should objection be made by two or more Members to the consideration of any bill or resolution so called, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker. Such bills and resolutions, if considered, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. No other business shall be in order on this day unless the House, by two-thirds vote on motion to dispense therewith, shall otherwise determine. On such motion debate shall be limited to 5 minutes for and 5 minutes against said motion.

"On the third Tuesday of each month after the disposal of such business on the Speaker's table as requires reference only, the Speaker may direct the Clerk to call the bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar, preference to be given to omnibus bills containing bills or resolutions which have previously been objected to on a call of the Private Calendar. All bills and resolutions on the Private Calendar so called, if considered, shall be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Should objection be made by two or more members to the consideration of any bill or resolution other than an omnibus bill, it shall be recommitted to the committee which reported the bill or resolution and no reservation of objection shall be entertained by the Speaker.

"Omnibus bills shall be read for amendment by paragraph, and no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations. Any item or matter stricken from an omnibus bill shall not thereafter during the same session of Congress be included in any omnibus bill.

"Upon passage of any such omnibus bill, said bill shall be resolved into the several bills and resolutions of which it is composed, and such original bills and resolutions, with any amendments adopted by the House, shall be engrossed, where necessary, and proceedings thereon had as if said bills and resolutions had been passed in the House severally.

"In the consideration of any omnibus bill the proceedings as set forth above shall have the same force and effect as if each Senate and House bill or resolution therein contained or referred to were considered by the House as a separate and distinct bill or resolution."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the resolution. If the gentleman from New York [Mr. O'CONNOR], would permit, I would like to ask him a question or two on procedure.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would like to have the point of order disposed of first.

Mr. BLANTON. Whether or not I would press the point of order would depend on the gentleman's answers. If I could ask the gentleman a question or two, probably it would save discussion.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would rather hear the point of order before we proceed.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I raise the point of order that this resolution is not privileged from the Committee on Rules; that the Committee on Rules has no authority, in the way that this rule was introduced and passed upon by the committee and reported, to report such a resolution to the House. Only a joint resolution passed by both the House and Senate, and signed by the President, could authorize this House to pass an omnibus bill, embracing the amounts carried in many private bills, and then, after passage, send all of such private bills to the Senate as bills regularly engrossed and passed by the House, as this rule proposes, when they were not so engrossed and passed.

For a hundred years it has been the practice in the House of Representatives that all bills involving a charge upon the Treasury must be considered in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, unless otherwise considered by unanimous consent. The purpose of that is very apparent, because where bills are considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole, the rule changes entirely. They are absolutely in charge of the one who has charge of the legislation on the floor that day. The one in charge of that legislation can move the previous question at any time and shut off debate.

Under this particular rule there could and probably would be thousands of bills, which in the last quarter of a century have been killed by this House, old bills, hoary with age and time, bills a hundred years old, involving millions of dollars, that could be put back on the calendar, and not a Member of this House would have an opportunity to even raise his voice to show why he made objection to their passage.

Unless there be two Members simultaneously objecting to it, the bill would be passed. That would necessitate an entire change of procedure. It would necessitate a Member who was conscientiously studying and watching improper bills going around to the offices of other Members and making an argument in the Member's office to show why a certain bill should not be passed, in order to get someone to object to it. That is not a part of the duty of a Member of the House of Representatives of this great Congress.

I have been here 18 years. I have never arbitrarily objected to a bill in my life. I have never objected to a meritorious bill. Every bill that I have ever objected to has been a bill that I conscientiously studied and looked up the facts and thought it was a bad bill. Some have been bills, like the Sevier heirs bill, a hundred years old and involving a hundred million dollars. I stopped that bill and finally killed it. But it could be revived and passed under this rule.

When I have objected to certain bills and some of my colleagues have told me the facts which would show there was reason for passing the bill and convinced me of their merit, I have universally withdrawn my objection and helped to pass the bill where there was merit in it.

I recognize full well that instances have arisen when through anger some Member has arbitrarily objected to practically all bills called up that night, but that is the exception.

Now, this is a radical change in the procedure of the House. It is an overturning of the rules that have been in existence for a hundred years, and, Mr. Speaker, if this rule were passed, we might as well take the Treasury door off

its hinges and leave it wide open without a guard and let every person in the United States who wanted a big hand-out of several hundred thousand dollars reach his long, hairy arm in and take out what he wanted.

With this proposed rule passed it will be impossible to prevent the passage of the numerous bad bills which have been favorably reported through the years gone by. All will be passed.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TABER. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes the point of order that there is not a quorum present. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Evidently there is no quorum present.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. CULLEN. Mr. Speaker, I move a call of the House.

A call of the House was ordered.

The Clerk called the roll, and the following Members failed to answer to their names:

[Roll No. 38]

Adair	Dickstein	Houston	Pierce
Allen	Dirksen	Johnson, Okla.	Rabaut
Andrews, N. Y.	Doutrich	Johnson, W. Va.	Ramsay
Arends	Dunn, Miss.	Kahn	Rayburn
Bacon	Dunn, Pa.	Kennedy, Md.	Robison, Ky.
Bankhead	Farley	Kimball	Ryan
Beam	Ferguson	Kleberg	Sabath
Bland	Flesinger	Kramer	Schaefer
Bolleau	Flannagan	Kvale	Seger
Bolton	Fletcher	Lamneck	Shannon
Bulwinkle	Ford, Calif.	Lesinski	Smith, Wash.
Cannon, Wis.	Fulmer	McGehee	Smith, W. Va.
Carden	Gambrill	McGroarty	Snell
Casey	Gehrman	McKeough	Snyder
Cavichia	Goldsborough	McLean	Somers
Chapman	Granfield	McMillan	Stack
Claiborne	Greenway	McSwain	Steagall
Clark, Idaho	Greenwood	Meeks	Stewart
Cooper, Ohio	Griswold	Merritt, Conn.	Terry
Crosby	Hamlin	Mitchell, Ill.	Tobey
Crowther	Hancock, N. C.	Norton	Truax
Cummings	Harter	O'Malley	Warren
Dear	Healey	Palmisano	Werner
Dempsey	Hess	Pearson	Withrow
DeRouen	Hollister	Peyser	Wood

The SPEAKER. Three hundred and thirty-one Members are present, a quorum.

On motion of Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado, further proceedings under the call were dispensed with.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to hear me just a moment further on the point of order.

I make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, that the Rules Committee, with all of its power, has no authority to bring in a rule that will take away from all of the 435 Representatives of the people in the House of Representatives their representative capacity, their privilege of representing the people of the United States as Members of different districts in Congress, with the inherent right to be heard on public questions, especially upon legislation coming up in the House that takes large sums of money out of the Treasury.

Now, if this rule is passed, it will take away from every Member of this House, except the chairman of the committee in charge of legislation on private bill day, the right to be heard, the inherent right to be heard, in his representative capacity on legislation and his right to protest against the passage of bad bills that will wrongfully take large sums of money from the Public Treasury. Why, the one in charge of legislation at that time could move the previous question immediately if he wanted to, for such bills are to be considered in the House.

If the Rules Committee has authority to bring in this kind of rule, Mr. Speaker, I submit to the Chair in all earnestness it has authority to bring in a rule on the floor of this House that will prevent any Member of the House of Representatives, except a member of the Rules Committee, from being heard on any kind of bill that comes up in the House. It would permit the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker, to bring in a rule that would force the consideration of

every supply bill, of every big appropriation bill, to be heard without any debate in the House instead of in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Why, the chairman would have the authority to move the previous question any time he wanted to and prevent every Member on the floor except himself from being heard.

The SPEAKER. Of course, the gentleman knows that in passing on a point of order the Chair cannot take into consideration the effect of a resolution or bill that may be pending; that is a matter that must be considered by the membership itself with respect to the legislation in question.

Mr. BLANTON. The present occupant of the chair is one of the best parliamentarians in the House, and he knows that is the situation; he knows that the Rules Committee has that power; it has the power to take away from every Representative here his representative capacity.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield.

Mr. MICHENER. The Rules Committee brings in gag rules right along, as it has a perfect right to, rules which take away from the gentleman the very rights he is now talking about, yet he votes for them.

Mr. BLANTON. Of all the gag rules that have been brought into the House since I have been here, from both the Republican and the Democratic side, this is the quintessential prince [laughter] of gag rules that takes away from a Representative his rights, capacities, and privileges as a Member of Congress.

Mr. MICHENER. I know, but it is just progressive; it is getting better every day, more stringent.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, of course, if the House wants to tie its hands and feet and put a gag in its mouth; if it wants to put a bandage around its eyes and stuff up its ears so it can neither see, nor hear, nor talk, nor walk, nor even crawl, why, let it do so, by passing this unwise, unsound rule.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I yield, although I am through.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman from Texas explain to the House why it is any different from action the House itself has taken on legislation—

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman from Pennsylvania again is going into politics.

Mr. RICH. Why is it any different for the Rules Committee to take power from the Members of Congress than it is for Members of Congress to turn their power over to the President of the United States?

Mr. BLANTON. I am not discussing partisan politics. I am in favor of some of the rules that the Rules Committee brings in to carry out the policies of the Chief Executive of this Nation, so he can put his policies into effect. I am in favor of that kind of rule and have supported them.

Mr. RICH. The only trouble is that the Chief Executive of the Nation is doing those things that are contrary to the rules; and the American people will not stand for it.

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, that is politics, pure and simple. If we pass this proposed rule, we are taking our means of properly representing our constituents away from ourselves respecting our own procedure. But I have done my duty in making this point of order and in registering my objection to this rule. I have performed my duty.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, may I be heard on the point of order?

The SPEAKER. The Chair will hear the gentleman on the point of order.

Mr. LEHLBACH. Mr. Speaker, rule XI, paragraph 45, reads as follows:

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business.

The resolution under discussion is a resolution amending rule XXIV of the House of Representatives. This disposes of the point of order.

The only reason I can see that this point of order was raised, having absolutely no merit, and not having been pressed in any way with sincerity, was in order to give the

gentleman a chance to take the floor and attack this resolution before its introducer, the Chairman of the Committee on Rules, who has charge of the debate in this House on this rule, has had an opportunity to say a word.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman is a Daniel come to judgment.

The SPEAKER. In disposing of a point of order it is not within the province of the Chair to consider the effect, or what may be the effect, of the passage of any rule or legislation which may be pending. After all, rules reported by the Committee on Rules must be considered and acted upon by a majority of the House, which action, of course, is controlling.

The gentleman from New Jersey has read from clause 45 of rule XI, which, with the permission of the House, the Chair will reread:

The following-named committees shall have leave to report at any time on the matters herein stated, namely: The Committee on Rules, on rules, joint rules, and order of business.

The pending resolution proposes to amend the rules of the House, it relates to the order of business in the House, and, under the rule the Chair has just read, is made a matter of privilege.

The point of order is overruled.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. COCHRAN. Is this resolution subject to the Ramseyer rule?

If it is, I make the point of order that the report does not comply with that rule.

The SPEAKER. The Ramseyer rule, to which the gentleman refers, has to do with reports of committees on bills which amend the statutes. This resolution proposes to amend the rules of the House, and therefore does not come within the provisions of clause 2a of rule XIII, the so-called "Ramseyer rule." The Chair, therefore, does not think that the Ramseyer rule applies to this report of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RANSLEY].

Mr. Speaker, there should not be so much excitement over a matter which has been before the House for so long a time. The reason we called this resolution up today is to dispose of it, as it was on the program for today and we hoped to take up the Private Calendar on Friday next to try out this new rule.

I must correct some misstatements made by the gentleman from Texas about not giving him time. The gentleman well knows that in the presence of several others this morning I said I would give him 10 minutes in opposition to the rule. So his repeated statement that he was not to be given any time is quite beside the fact.

Mr. Speaker, under the guise of a point of order the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] proceeded to take the time to discuss the merits of the bill. The gentleman spoke about one man being entitled to certain constitutional rights in this House in connection with legislation. This rule attempts to stop one man from holding up the proceedings of this House. [Applause.] That man when he is talking could himself be stopped by any Member of the House objecting to his speaking out of order or under the guise of a reservation of objection.

Something was said to the effect that the Rules Committee could not provide for the consideration in the House rather than in the Committee of the Whole of certain legislation. That is not the fact. The Rules Committee can, and often does, provide for such consideration and could do so as to a general supply bill. The Rules Committee could provide that it be considered in the House rather than in the Committee of the Whole.

What does this rule really do? This rule has been considered thoroughly for 9 months by the Rules Committee. Every Member of the House has been written to several times. Hundreds of ideas have been collected. The proceedings of all the parliamentary bodies of the world with similar situations have been examined, and after days and

days of thorough consideration by the Rules Committee this rule was brought out for the purposes of serving the Members of this House and to prevent the disgraceful proceedings we have seen occur here in connection with the consideration of the Private Calendar.

Mr. Speaker, this rule provides 2 days a month for the consideration of the Private Calendar. It provides that on the first Tuesday the individual bills will be called up, and if objection is made by two Members the bills shall be re-committed automatically to the committee which reported them, such as the Claims Committee, the Military Affairs Committee, and so forth. The rule reported some weeks ago provided for three objectors. After reconsideration the Rules Committee reduced the requirement to two objections. That was a compromise. Why did we require at least two? Because we have seen it happen in this House that where some one Member's bill was objected to, he immediately proceeded because he was "mad"—and that is the only word that describes the situation—to object to every bill on the calendar. We thought two objections would make it a little harder for the irascible one to get a partner or a pal to join with him in "knocking out" the whole calendar.

Mr. EAGLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I would prefer to finish my statement first.

Mr. EAGLE. Replying to that remark of my friend, I do not want it forgotten that I will do the same thing during the rest of this session if one man can continue to stop the consideration of an honest bill like the one I had up for consideration last session.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We are trying to meet the gentleman's objection, and I know he is sympathetic with what we are proposing here.

Mr. EAGLE. I am entirely so.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, we are hoping that the objections will not be arbitrary. Two objections are required. Of course, you cannot look into men's minds, but there is a feeling in this House that many times an objection has been made arbitrarily and sometimes by self-appointed objectors, with no official or even unofficial standing.

If two objections are made, the bill is re-committed to the committee which reported the bill. That committee may take those bills to which objection has been made and put them in an omnibus bill.

Mr. Speaker, before I get to that subject, may I say that in connection with the first objections we prevent any reservations of objection. We prevent speeches. I will admit that is possibly a controversial point, but most of the speeches I have heard here, and maybe some of you will agree with me, were not directed to even the merits of the bill. There were speeches on collateral matters, for consumption back home or just a blanket charge against this, that, or the other type of bills, or advanced under the guise of protecting the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, the crux of this bill is to stop this talk. You must understand there is no right of "reservation of objection" under the rules of the House. That practice is violently abused every morning, which could be cut off instantly by a call for the regular order. This abuse should not be permitted unless a Member is in earnest and desires to state his case. If he is in earnest, he can get permission to talk by unanimous consent. I am sure this House will not deny this right to a man, particularly the proponent of a bill, if he asks such unanimous consent in order to explain the bill for a few minutes.

On the third Tuesday of each month the committees are authorized to bring in or to have on the calendar on that day omnibus bills. As I said before on the floor, we hope the committee will set aside a select subcommittee of men who have not previously reported bills, and that this select committee will go through these objected-to bills and will pick out the ones they think should have their day in the House and bring them in in an omnibus bill preferably, and, if possible, bringing in bills relating to one subject, like compensation bills, tort bills, and the various subjects before the committees. We hope the committee will not perfunctorily

include in an omnibus bill every bill that has been objected to. If the committees do this, then the question will be before the Rules Committee as to whether or not we should make a further effort to change this rule.

The Rules Committee holds no brief for this rule as a cure-all; perhaps it will not work; it is however, an honest attempt to give the Members of the House a chance to have their private bills passed upon.

On the third Tuesday of each month the Private Calendar is called again, and on that calendar there may be private individual bills and omnibus bills. The omnibus bills are called first. They are read for amendment by paragraphs. Any item can be stricken out, debate can be had on them, and any Member who objected to the bill before, or any other Member, can move to strike out the paragraph. If he can convince the House that the bill should not be passed, the House will agree with him. Then when the omnibus bills are passed they are broken down into individual bills and sent to the Senate.

I do not believe any individual on the Rules Committee had any particular bill in mind. Some have introduced very few private bills. However, we feel there never has been a fair chance for the consideration of these private bills.

In the last 30 years only on two occasions have private bills been considered under any rule of the House. There was a statement here today by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] that this rule of the House for the consideration of the Private Calendar has stood for 100 years—the method whereby you take up bills by unanimous consent. There is no such rule of the House. There never was such a rule of the House. There is a rule of the House for the consideration of private bills, but it has not worked because of a filibuster started against it the first time we attempted to use it.

We are here now with a new proposition in an attempt to stop such a filibuster. Let me state also, and this may sound a little strange, I have never comprehended why we do have so-called "official objectors" on either side of this aisle. It strikes me as a creation that is in itself offensive. On the opening of Congress, the majority, in its caucus, and the present minority, in its conference, elect members to the Claims Committee and the Military Affairs Committee and the Public Lands Committee and other committees which report private bills. The House then itself elects these men to the committees. They have faith in the members of those committees. There are always fine men and women on those committees. The committees report these private bills, usually unanimously, and yet in spite of this we have "official objectors", a supercommittee, as it were, sitting in the House overruling these standing committees of the House, committees of our own creation. I never could appreciate how such a system ever developed. It is not according to any rules of the House. Of course, some of the objectors, as I have said, are self-appointed, self-constituted "guardians of the Treasury", trying to prevent, in some instances, \$100 being paid to a poor woman whose husband was injured, and at the same time voting for millions to eradicate the bollweevil or the Mediterranean fly or some similar insect in his district.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. MAY. I remember very well having received several letters from the gentleman, who is the Chairman of the Rules Committee, with regard to a correction of this rule, and not having had a chance to consider the rule before, I would like to make a suggestion or call his attention to that part of the rule on page 2, beginning at line 19, which provides that the omnibus bill when it is presented shall be read for amendment by paragraphs. I think this rule possibly ought to go far enough to provide that when an omnibus bill is reported each private bill shall be set out in a separate paragraph.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It will be, I am sure. The mechanics of working out the resolution are just that, and that is the only way it could be done. At present every omnibus bill that comes into the House, for instance, from the Pensions Committee has each item as a separate paragraph, and that method meets the intention of this measure.

Mr. FADDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. FADDIS. It seems to me as if this bill is written more from the viewpoint of the Committee on Claims than any other committee. As I look at it, the Committee on Claims and the Committee on Military Affairs are the ones that produce most of the private bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Naval Affairs, of course, would rank with Military Affairs.

Mr. FADDIS. Yes. The resolution provides, in line 20, page 2, that no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations. This does not give us an opportunity in the Committee on Military Affairs or the Committee on Naval Affairs to strike out anything unless a certain amount of the appropriation is to be stricken.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Oh, the striking out is separate. You can strike out the whole provision, strike out or reduce. For instance, if it is a bill for the relief of John Jones you can strike the whole bill out.

Mr. BEITER. Will the gentleman state how many objections it takes to an omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. There can be no objection to an omnibus bill, it is read for and is open for amendment. There can be debate on the amendments, and amendments may be offered to strike out or reduce or offer limitations. These amendments will afford opportunity for anyone to express objection to the bill.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Is the gentleman going to permit any amendment to this resolution?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Well, I have not thought of it.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman give a little thought to it now? [Laughter.]

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. COCHRAN. I am generally around when the Private Calendar is taken up, and the gentleman from New York is usually here. If we have an omnibus bill before the House, the gentleman knows well, and I know, that every 7 out of 10 men on the floor on Private Calendar day will be men who have bills on the calendar. Assuming you have an omnibus bill up, and everybody on the floor of the House is interested in that omnibus bill, and I rise and move to strike out a certain bill. Do you think I am going to get support from Members who have their bills on that calendar?

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman does not think that Members are going to do any logrolling here?

Mr. COCHRAN. I am not going to say anything against any Member, but the gentleman and I both know what has transpired in the past. Members do not object when they have bills on the calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I hope that will not happen.

Mr. COCHRAN. Let us hope. [Laughter.]

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Why not try out objections by three Members rather than have this provision as to omnibus bills?

Mr. O'CONNOR. This matter has been before the House for 1 month at least. Every Member was invited to appear before the Committee on Rules and present his objections. Notwithstanding that invitation we have not heard any Member of the House object to this resolution, except one, and that is not the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I agree that sometimes bills have met with arbitrary objection. But it seems to me that if it required three objections there would not be any arbitrary objection. The gentleman from New York is interested in an \$800,000 matter.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not know whether it is still extant, but I do know it has been kicked around here for about

17 years—a bill I inherited from my predecessors and do not even know the parties concerned.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I know that the gentleman is very much interested in a bill carrying \$800,000.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The gentleman is wrong. I have no interest in the bill, except that it has been here for about 17 years, and the Federal Reserve, as well as the Secretary of State, say that a gross injustice was done the claimant. Just because the amount is large, there has been no opportunity of passing it through the House. It has always been objected to arbitrarily, and no one can honestly deny that.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The gentleman understands that I did not object to the bill; but I do know this: That the objectors in the House have been so liberal that the President has had to veto several bills that have been passed by the objectors. In this way every bill will have to go to the President, and the President will have to be the objectors' committee and not the House, and the Lord knows the President has enough to do without legislating for the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I do not agree with the gentleman that any more bills will go to the President than go now.

Mr. NICHOLS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. NICHOLS. If committees followed the suggestion of the Chairman of the Committee on Rules and appointed subcommittees whose functions it would be to consider the bills that were referred back to the committee which had met with two objections, and the proponents and opponents of the bill were invited to come before the subcommittee and took advantage of that opportunity, would they not have more opportunity and longer time to be heard and a better opportunity to clearly state their case than they have under the present rule?

Mr. O'CONNOR. We hope that will work out and that when objections are made and the bill goes back to the committee, that the committee will invite those objectors in to state their reasons; and, if they can convince the committee, then the committee will not put that bill in an omnibus bill. I am willing to wager, however, that on very few occasions will the objectors show up.

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. BLOOM. In case an omnibus bill is under consideration, would it be necessary to finish that omnibus bill in its entirety before a motion to adjourn would be in order? How would you protect the omnibus bill itself and also the other bills that are included in the omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. You cannot protect bills against a filibuster.

Mr. BLOOM. What happens to the omnibus bill if there is no quorum present and an adjournment is had?

Mr. O'CONNOR. It would, in my opinion, be still pending when the Private Calendar of omnibus bills is taken up again.

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MOTT. Since we have the right to cut off useless talk at any time by calling for the regular order, what is the reason for prohibiting a reservation of the right to object? Under this proposed rule one cannot reserve the right to object.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is correct.

Mr. MOTT. What is the merit in prohibiting that since we already have the right to stop anyone engaging in useless talk by calling for the regular order?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I might say it was more or less a question of psychology. Reservations of objection would not be attempted if there is a rule against them, whereas reservations of objection on one bill here at the present time often takes an hour. Further, if you cut off a man, he gets mad. That is what happens. If you have a rule that there can be no reservations of objection, then you will have no talk. That is the theory of this rule.

Mr. MILLARD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. MILLARD. Did the gentleman's committee consider the fact about the age of these bills that go into the omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is within the discretion of the reporting committees. Any arbitrary rule cannot be laid down. Some committees already have such rules. Rules Committee did not care to interfere with the standing committees of the House, which are on a parity with all committees.

Mr. MILLARD. Does the gentleman not think it rather dangerous to put in bills 20 years' old into an omnibus bill?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Offhand I would not say. It depends on the particular bill.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. O'CONNOR. Yes.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. What good reason is there for limiting the amendments that may be offered? We are limited here by the language at the bottom of page 2:

And no amendment shall be in order except to strike out or to reduce amounts of money stated or to provide limitations.

There are cases when other amendments than those provided for are desirable.

Mr. O'CONNOR. It was not called to the attention of the Rules Committee that there are any other cases where honest amendments are necessary. What is attempted to be done in that provision is similar to what we do in preventing a reservation of objection. We prevent pro forma amendments. That is all we attempted to do—to prevent amendments striking out the last word, and so forth. We thought by the provision we have inserted there about amendments we had met every situation where a necessary amendment could be offered to the paragraph.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Would not the gentleman accomplish his purpose by making it out of order to offer pro forma amendments?

Mr. O'CONNOR. That might not meet the entire satisfaction. We did want to stop filibustering. We want to do business in the consideration of the Private Calendar. Members are often more concerned with that calendar individually than with other measures before the House.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Clarifying language is very frequently required in these private bills.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I believe if the gentleman had an amendment which was of a different nature than strictly permitted under this rule and offered it, he would be granted unanimous consent to do so. He could always request unanimous consent to offer it in spite of this rule.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. O'CONNOR. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. The sum and substance of this bill with the omnibus measure in it provides that every bill that is reported by the regular standing committees of the House will be passed in the House, because no bill which will be rereferred to them, will be excluded from the omnibus bill.

Mr. O'CONNOR. If that happens, as I stated before, then something will have to be done further about the rule.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. But, in my opinion, that is what will happen. Personally I am not going to be on the Private Calendar.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We shall have to meet that situation when we come to it.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this rule has been referred to as a "gag" rule. Why, it is just the opposite. This rule takes away the power and ability of one man in the House to "gag" the entire Membership of the House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE].

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, I hesitate to say anything in opposition to this change in the rules, because I realize that the method in effect for considering private bills in the past has been somewhat unsatisfactory. I believe, however, that the reason for this is not so much the method of consideration, as the fact that the proper amount of time has not been given this class of legislation. The Private Calen-

dar is a sort of stepchild, as far as this House is concerned, and generally speaking has been considered only when the House had nothing else to do. This proposed rule requires that 2 days in each month be devoted to the Private Calendar. If we would adopt that provision, and perhaps a provision that there should be three objections before a bill finally goes off the calendar, I think we would have a fairly satisfactory rule as far as the Private Calendar is concerned.

Now, if we adopt this rule, what will happen is just as was suggested by the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK], namely, every bill which has the favorable report of a committee of this House will be passed. The first objection, that is, the objection which is made when the bill first comes up as a separate bill, is not going to count for anything, because the bill will then go back to the committee, and it is only reasonable to suppose that the committee which reported the bill in the first instance, after giving it what we must assume was careful consideration will again report it in an omnibus bill. Now, when the bill does come back as part of an omnibus bill, there is no chance, in my opinion, to strike it out although it may be quite objectionable.

Those of us who have been here when omnibus pension bills were considered know that those bills have gone through in practically every instance by unanimous consent. Why? Because almost every Member of the House had a bill included in that omnibus bill. This is no particular reflection on Members of the House, nor is any criticism implied. The result follows, however, because each Member is interested in his own bills, which he naturally regards as meritorious, and is not concerned about any of the many other provisions of the omnibus bill. The same situation will be true under this plan, because most of those who are in attendance in the House when an omnibus bill comes up will be those interested in bills contained in that bill. It is too much to expect that they will vote to strike out a bill included in the omnibus bill upon the very small amount of information which they can get during the discussion which may be allowed incident to a motion to strike out that provision. So the result is going to be that we will pass every provision of the omnibus bill.

I think it is a very serious objection to this resolution that there is no provision for a reservation of objection, because without that provision there is nothing in the record to show why the Member who made the objection did so. The committee to which the bill is recommitted should have the benefit of that information. It would be shown in the Record, if Members were permitted to make a reservation of objection.

Furthermore, I know from my own experience as one of those who has had the unpleasant duty of objecting to some of these bills, that it is frequently to the advantage of a proponent of a bill to have this reservation of objection, because it gives him an opportunity to furnish information which has not been contained in the report of the committee. The committee reports generally contain the most important points of information regarding the bill, yet very frequently those reports, because they can not be too voluminous, will fail to give essential information which can only be developed by a reservation of objection.

My judgment is that the adoption of this rule will not solve the difficulties which have been met in the past in the consideration of private bills, but will add new ones, and will result in the passage of many bills which are not just claims against the Government.

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER].

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I think the Members of the House ought to understand this proposed rule and know what they are voting on before they vote.

In the first place, instead of being a rule to provide for more prompt and proper consideration of the Private Calendar, it is a rule which will do just the opposite. It will prevent proper consideration of the Private Calendar. It puts a man who objects to a bill, conscientiously, in the position of having to raise a point of no quorum every time

a bad bill is reached and he does not have anyone else who will join with him in objecting. It puts him in a position where he is free to take that position.

In the second place, it provides that no reservation of objection shall be permitted. The reservation of objection and explanation which the proponents of bills make, constitutes one of the very best features of the method by which we handle the Private Calendar, because if a man has a decent case and a decent bill, he does not object to a reservation of objection and he does not object to getting up and telling what the good points of his bill are.

Then there is a provision for an omnibus bill. If we are going to have an omnibus bill, let us look at the picture that will be presented. Suppose an omnibus bill is brought out by the Committee on Military Affairs, and suppose in that bill there is one item which goes through which wipes out a charge of desertion against a man who has no business to have any such thing done, and that there are along with that bill 8 or 10 others that are meritorious.

That one fly in the ointment will spoil the whole bill and the President will have to veto the whole bill. That is the way the thing will work, and I want the House to know just how it will work.

Mr. NICHOLS. Why could not that be corrected by simply offering an amendment to the bill at the time it was up for consideration to take that paragraph out?

Mr. TABER. That would be all right if it happened to be done, but all wrong if it did not happen to be done.

Mr. NICHOLS. If the objectors are here, as they ordinarily are, they could exercise that privilege.

Mr. TABER. There are lots of bad bills that will get into the omnibus bill.

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a correction?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. COCHRAN. If the gentleman will read the bill, he will find, on page 3, that, if an omnibus bill passes, it is separated.

Mr. BLOOM. It is broken down, and each bill is separated.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. To change the law respecting engrossed bills, we would have to have the Senate agree to this and the President sign it.

Mr. TABER. The gentleman is correct; this would have to be a joint resolution if that were going to be done; there is no question about it; it would have to be a joint resolution; the President would have to sign it, and, even then, I do not know that it would be constitutional; it might take an amendment to the Constitution. That is about it, is it not?

Mr. BLANTON. If anybody raised the question. And the question certainly will be raised when bad bills are passed.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If objectors on the Democratic side of the House and on the Republican side of the House objected to bills and those bills were embodied in an omnibus bill and the omnibus bill passed, never would anyone object to a bill any more, for there would be no use in objecting.

Mr. TABER. It would destroy the morale of those who were trying to protect the integrity of the Treasury.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman will yield for a further question, I should like to know whether in the gentleman's experience more personal pressure is not put on for private bills than for public bills by individual Members of the House?

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I have never served on the objecting committees. I have objected to some bills that I thought were bad, but I have not had the experience that has been had by the gentleman from Washington, the gentleman from

Texas, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK], and others who served on these committees.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. If the gentleman will accept my statement, there is more personal pressure, more personality that enters into private bills than public bills in that the Claims Committee cannot thoroughly go into the hundreds and hundreds of bills they have.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. From influences both inside and outside of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. It has been my observation, after watching the Private Calendar for 3 or 4 years, that 9 out of 10 objections that are made are made conscientiously. The arbitrary, spiteful objection is very rare; which means, if I am correct in this statement, that every bill that goes into an omnibus bill will be a questionable bill. So if we pass an omnibus bill we pass bad bills by the wholesale. That will be the result.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. Every lawyer and parliamentarian of the House knows that if you pass an omnibus bill under a resolution like this you could not afterward separate those amounts carried in the paragraphs of the omnibus bill back into separate bills and send them to the Senate and White House, when they had never been engrossed and passed, unless you had a joint resolution signed by the Senate and President authorizing it.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe you could do it even then unless you had an amendment to the Constitution.

Mr. BLANTON. And unless it were passed by the Senate and signed by the President.

Mr. TABER. Yes.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We considered that subject and attempted to reach it by the last paragraph of the resolution, on page 3; and we felt that we had met it. The parliamentarians on the gentleman's side agreed with some of the Members on this side that in an omnibus bill just the title of the bills will be referred to, probably in some little detail. The gentleman knows we can pass a bill here just by reading the title.

Mr. TABER. We certainly can make no rule which would permit a bill to be segregated into 15 or 20 bills without the concurrence of the Senate and the President; and, frankly, I do not believe we can even then.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We do it with pension bills.

Mr. TABER. Only because the pension bill cannot be vetoed except en gross.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is the purpose of breaking this down. If the President had an omnibus bill before him, of course, he could not veto one item but would have to veto the entire bill; so we broke down the omnibus bill and separate bills go to the Senate and to the President.

Mr. TABER. Frankly, I do not believe this can be done by a resolution of the House.

Mr. O'CONNOR. We hope so.

Mr. TABER. I do not believe it would be valid. I do not believe any student of the Constitution would say it was valid.

Mr. BLANTON. And the Comptroller General would stop payment.

Mr. TABER. I think he would stop payment of the items; and the Supreme Court certainly would overrule that sort of thing.

I do not believe that we ought to require those who are called upon as a patriotic duty and by their leaders on both sides to make a point of no quorum in order to stop the bills. I do not believe this resolution will bring about the result that the gentleman from New York has intimated he desires.

I think it might be a good thing to increase the number of objectors to two, but I think if we do that we have done all that we ought to do as a try-out for this kind of a proposition. We ought not to put into effect this omnibus proposition.

I hope that the House will vote down the previous question and amend this proposition so that an omnibus bill will not be permitted, with all the mixed-up language there is here and all the involvements there are to make consideration of the Private Calendar almost an impossibility. We have tried for years and years to correct the Private Calendar situation.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman 1 additional minute.

Mr. TABER. We have always come back to the proposition of asking unanimous consent of the House to consider the Private Calendar and only permit to be considered bills unobjected to. I do not think this rule will get away from that situation. I do not believe anything can be done along that line unless we try the proposition of two objections, and I am willing to do that if the Members will vote down the previous question and strike out the omnibus business.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TABER. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. The omnibus-bill feature was suggested by a gentleman on that side of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH], than whom there is no better parliamentarian in this House.

Mr. TABER. I think the gentleman is correct.

Mr. O'CONNOR. He suggested an omnibus bill and it was practically that suggestion which was carried into this rule. I may say that this is the first time we ever heard from either side of the House an objection to the omnibus feature of the bill.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. MOTT].

Mr. MOTT. Mr. Speaker, I view with a great deal of sympathy the attempt of the Rules Committee to solve this very difficult problem of the Private Calendar, but I am not at all convinced they have arrived at the correct solution. I think removing the privilege to reserve the right to object is a very serious thing and will prove in the end to be detrimental.

As I understand from the explanation of the gentleman from New York, the Chairman of the Rules Committee [Mr. O'CONNOR], one of the objects of this resolution is to prevent Members from becoming angry at each other. I cannot imagine a situation which would be more conducive to anger on the part of Members than for one Member to have his bill objected to and killed without having an opportunity even to offer an explanation for the bill, or to defend it in any way.

Mr. LLOYD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. LLOYD. Would not the same result be accomplished by a request to the objecting Member to withhold his objection while unanimous consent to explain the bill is asked?

Mr. MOTT. I do not believe that would solve the problem, and I do not think it would be a proper substitute for reserving the right to object.

Mr. Speaker, it has been very properly said here today that reservation of objection is a thing much abused. We all know, of course, that it has been abused in the past. Members will reserve the right to object, and then proceed to talk about everything except what is pertinent to the bill.

However, we have a well-nigh perfect remedy for stopping that sort of thing. Because we have been lax in the past and have not exercised the right to stop abuse of the privilege of talking is certainly no reason why we should not and cannot exercise it in the future. We can if we want to. I believe when a Member deliberately abuses the privilege of speaking under a reservation of objection that such Member should be immediately called to order. I think the

House can easily accustom itself to enforcing this remedy if it will make up its mind to do so.

Mr. PITTENGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. PITTENGER. Is it not a fact that these reservations of objection in most instances are simply for the opportunity to make a speech, and if the regular order is demanded an objection is made, anyway?

Mr. MOTT. I would not say so.

Mr. PITTENGER. I may say that that has been my observation and my experience.

Mr. MOTT. I do not think that is the general rule. I think it is rather the exception to the rule.

Mr. Speaker, during the last session on several occasions I had bills on the Private Calendar which were called and to which an objection was made. In each instance I requested that the objection be withheld for the purpose of making a short, simple explanation. My recollection is that in nearly every case the explanation satisfied the objector and that the objection was withdrawn.

On the other hand, under the proposed rule, if a bill should come up on the Private Calendar that I did not quite understand, I would be very prone to object to the bill if I thought an objection was merited, but I would not be allowed even to state my reason for objecting. Under the present system, I think we are following a fairer and a better procedure than that. In such a case as I have just mentioned I can, under the present procedure, reserve the right to object, ask the author of the bill a simple question which probably will clear the whole thing up in my mind, and in that case I can then withdraw the objection. The bill can then be passed, as it ought to be passed if it is meritorious.

I think the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] is right in his suggestion that we first try out this new procedure by providing for 2 or possibly 3 objections to start with. This will speed up the procedure, and it will not make anyone justifiably angry on account of an objection. I think if we start that way we can get used to it very easily, and that from then on we can function under the Private Calendar in fairly good order and with reasonable speed.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. RANSLEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HANCOCK].

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Mr. Speaker, I had not planned to make any comment on this resolution in addition to those I have already made. I think, however, the Chairman of the Rules Committee misspoke when he said that it was the idea of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] to amend the rules so as to provide for an omnibus bill to carry the bills that were objectionable. As I remember his speech on that subject made several weeks ago, his idea was exactly the opposite. He proposed that the objectors on both sides examine the bills on the Private Calendar—and there are many that are purely formal and that no one can possibly object to—and that these bills be included in an omnibus bill which could be disposed of at once.

This is my recollection of the suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH]. He recommended not that objectionable bills should be passed by the wholesale, but that unobjectionable bills should be passed in this way.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. I yield.

Mr. O'CONNOR. I think the gentleman is mistaken. The difference between the suggestion of the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. LEHLBACH] and the pending suggestion is that the gentleman from New Jersey would set up a supercommittee, elected by the House, to review the bills and that supercommittee would take the objected-to bills and would consider putting them in an omnibus bill, but we think that to set up a supercommittee over the other committees would not be a respectable recognition of the standing committees of the House.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. Of course, if there were no such thing as an official objector, the legislative committees

of the House would take their duties much more seriously and many of the bills now reported would be killed in committee.

Mr. O'CONNOR. That is what I have said.

Mr. HANCOCK of New York. The fact that we have objectors makes them necessary, because time after time the committees will say to a Member, "We will report out your bill and you can take your chances on the floor." So these official objectors do perform a very necessary function.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I have performed my duty when I have expressed my opposition to this bill. No special responsibility rests upon my shoulders to study, investigate, and oppose bad bills. I think the same responsibility rests upon the shoulders of every one of the 435 Members of the House equally to stop bad bills.

When I first came to Congress in 1917, Mr. Garner, who was in charge of the Ways and Means Committee so far as our State was concerned, placed me on the Claims Committee and asked me on behalf of the Membership to watch these claims carefully. You will find in the Claims Committee during the first 3 years I served there a whole book of adverse reports that I filed on unmeritorious-claims bills. You will find one of them involved \$100,000,000.

After I went off of that committee I became interested in watching them and I continued to watch them. When Mr. Garner was Speaker of this House he asked me on behalf of the Speaker to watch bad bills, and I was one of those who did it. When Mr. Speaker Rainey was elected Speaker of this House he asked me to be one of those who would watch bad bills and I performed that duty at his request. When the present Speaker of this House was elected he asked me to perform this duty and I have been performing it all the time at the request of those in authority in the House.

The present resolution rose because one of our colleagues, although I did not agree with him, once objected to a bill of my friend, the gentleman from Texas, Mr. EAGLE, and becoming incensed, he stopped all the bills on the calendar.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. I objected to that bill.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; it was the gentleman from Washington who objected to Mr. EAGLE's bill on that occasion.

Mr. ZIONCHECK. And I would object to it again.

Mr. BLANTON. This occasioned all this dissension about private bills. I have seen 50 bills passed here in 1 night with all of these objectors present—good bills that should have been passed, and even then, on such rights, with all objectors watching, once in a while a bad bill would get by and the President would have to veto it.

I have no more interest or responsibility in this matter than any of my colleagues. If the House wants to pass a rule like this, it can do it, but I warn you that just as sure as it is passed it will let every single private bill go by, be passed hereafter, because there will be no way to stop them. You will find every bill on the calendar passed as called, and you will find that some of these bills are 100 years old and will involve millions of dollars that ought not to be thus wasted.

The gentleman from Washington called the attention of the gentleman from New York to his bill, the O'Connor bill, which was up in the last session, involving \$800,000. The gentleman from New York is one of the leading attorneys of that city. He is a member of one of the leading law firms there. Suppose his firm had a suit in court involving \$800,000, I dare say they would take a week or 10 days or 2 weeks to try it. They would not try it on affidavits. They would try it on the evidence of sworn witnesses.

But every bill that comes here is tried on affidavits. Usually you have only one side presented. You do not have the Government's side presented. There are affidavits from persons that the Membership of the House have never seen, and if they had a chance to examine them on the witness stand probably 9 out of 10 would fail. Are you in favor of trying \$800,000 cases in 1 minute, upon affidavits presented by only one side, and the other side not heard? That is the way they will be tried and passed under this rule. There

might be here under this proposed rule an omnibus bill that might contain a hundred and fifty bills, involving millions of dollars, which would pass unanimously on affidavits in 2 minutes' time because we could not get Members here who were the authors of such bills to stop it on private-bill night.

I remember in the last session of Congress when one of our distinguished friends from California on the first day of Congress introduced over 300 private bills, and one of them involved \$5,000,000,000. Do you want such bills to be put in an omnibus bill and passed in the twinkling of an eye, when no one can be heard, and no one will be allowed to speak against them?

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, how much time has the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. RANSLEY. I yield that to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I yield 7 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK].

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, when I came to Congress in 1929 I was assigned to the Claims Committee. I am still a member of that body. At the beginning of this Congress I was entitled to the chairmanship of that committee and also to the chairmanship of the Civil Service Committee, which I took instead. The gentleman from Maryland [Mr. KENNEDY] is Chairman of the Claims Committee and is undertaking to do a real job in that capacity.

Those who have served on that committee know that members of the committee have, for the most part, at least, rendered a distinct service to the Government, and that they do endeavor to give intelligent consideration to the private bills that come before the committee.

During the 5½ years that I have been a member of the committee the majority of the bills reported from the committee have not been considered because they were not reached on the calendar, or, if they were reached, they were objected to by some Member who had made but a casual examination.

I am not criticizing any Member of this House who opposed bills. I presume he did his duty as he saw it.

The point I make to Members of the House is this: That our constituents back home who claim to have been damaged or to have suffered a loss because of some act of some agency of the Government are the people who are entitled to consideration in this House. They have no other place to go. The only possible method of redress which they have is through a private bill introduced by their Congressman and considered on the floor of this body. If you are not going to give them their day in court, let us say so; do not let us go through this farce that we have been going through here where one man can get up, because his feelings have been ruffled, and object to a bill, which bill never has a chance of consideration.

With reference to the question of reservation of objection, the reason that is in the rule, I think, is because of a suggestion I made to the Rules Committee, and that is this: We find that about 50 percent of the bills reported by the Claims Committee, on an average, are passed. For a large part, at least, they are those to which nobody has any objection. They are the only ones that have been reached so far under the present regulations. Therefore let us try to pass those without any objection, without any reservation of objection, so that the good bills, the ones that everyone thinks are good, will pass on to the Senate and have a chance to become law.

Then we provide under this rule that those to which objection is made shall go back to the Committee on Claims, and it is understood by that committee and by the Committee on Rules that we are going to have a subcommittee of five of the Claims Committee, which has not heretofore considered the bills, review those bills to which objections have been made, and such as they agree shall come out of the committee again will be reported to the full committee for its consideration and for inclusion in an omnibus bill, if the committee so directs. Then, if they come out in an omnibus bill, they will be considered on this floor on their merits. I submit to the Mem-

bers of this body that there is nothing in this procedure that prevents the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] or the gentleman from Washington [Mr. ZIONCHECK] or the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. HOPE], or any other gentleman in this House, from stopping those bills if they are meritorious. I do not agree with the insinuations that have been made here today that Members of this House, because they have bills in the omnibus bill, will not stop other bills if such should get in the omnibus bill.

I believe there is enough courage in this House, I believe there are enough Members here who have some regard for their oath of office, to stop any bill if such should not get by under this procedure. I believe they will do it. I believe if the general Membership would not do it, that then the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] would do it by making a point of no quorum, and he can always do that under the procedure laid down, as was pointed out by the gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER]. Let us give this method a chance, and let us remember that our constituents deserve the right to their day in court. They are being damaged by trucks of the Post Office Department, by trucks of the Civilian Conservation Corps, by various agencies of this Government, and they do not have any day in court.

Fifty percent of the bills introduced in every Congress are never reached even for consideration under the present system, where one person arbitrarily—and I do not cast any reflection on those who object—can stop the consideration of a bill, and the result is that your constituent and mine have not had their day in court. I am not disturbed about raiding the Treasury. I do not believe any Congress is going to raid the Treasury, but I am disturbed about the failure of Congress to give consideration to the rights of our people who have suffered damages on the part of some agent of the Government, and who are entitled to have a hearing at the hands of the people who represent them.

Let us give a trial to this procedure, and if it does not work out, then we can adopt something else, but certainly under the present procedure the people of this country are not getting a square deal on private bills, and they ought to have that privilege.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSPECK. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. I am in entire accord with what the gentleman says, that every person who has a claim against the Government should have his day in court, and the gentleman has stated correctly that there are many bills on the Private Calendar never reached. That is because the House has neglected the Private Calendar. We do not need to pass this legislation in order to reach those cases. If the House will set aside enough days for the consideration of the Private Calendar, we will obviate that situation which I agree is deplorable.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I think we ought to try out this procedure and give the people of this country an opportunity to have their legislation considered on its merits. I do not think any bill ought to be passed by unanimous consent unless it is so meritorious that it is unanimous, and we all know that under the procedure we have here now such is not the case; a man has to get down on his knees and beg someone not to object.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired. All time has expired.

Mr. O'CONNOR. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. TABER) there were ayes 67 and noes 27.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman withhold that for a moment?

Mr. TABER. I will.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. McKEOUGH, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. SABATH, indefinitely, on account of important business.

To Mr. KVALE, for today, on account of illness.

To Mr. FERGUSON (at the request of Mr. NICHOLS), for 10 days, on account of important business.

To Mr. HESS (at the request of Mr. JENKINS of Ohio), for balance of the week, on account of important business.

To Mr. GRAY of Indiana, for 4 days, on account of important official business.

To Mr. POLK, for 1 week, on account of important business.

PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. TABER] objects to the vote because there is no quorum present. Evidently there is not a quorum present.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 6 minutes p. m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, March 27, 1935, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARING

COMMITTEE ON MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

(Wednesday, Mar. 27, 10 a. m.)

Committee will continue hearings on the President's message (Doc. No. 119) relative to subsidies.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

277. A letter from the Administrator of the Veterans' Administration, transmitting copy of letter addressed to Librarian, Library of Congress, under date of March 7, 1935, and reply thereto dated March 19, 1935, relative to certain records in storage in the Veterans' Administration, no longer of use or value, and recommended for destruction; to the Committee on Disposition of Useless Executive Papers.

278. A letter from the Chairman of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, transmitting report of activities and expenditures for February 1935, together with a statement of authorizations made during that month, showing the name, amount, and rate of interest or dividend in each case (H. Doc. No. 146); to the Committee on Banking and Currency and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: Committee on Flood Control. H. R. 6803. A bill to authorize funds for the prosecution of works for flood control and protection against flood disasters; without amendment (Rept. No. 486). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5789. A bill for the relief of the city of Perth Amboy, N. J.; with amendment (Rept. No. 507). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII,

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 284. A bill for the relief of John N. Brooks; with amendment (Rept. No. 487). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. H. R. 350. A bill for the relief of Florenz Gutierrez; with amendment (Rept. No. 488). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 812. A bill for the relief of Cora A. Bennett; with amendment (Rept. 489). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland. Committee on Claims. H. R. 949. A bill for the relief of Irvin Pendleton; with

amendment (Rept. No. 490). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1292. A bill for the relief of Grace McClure; with amendment (Rept. No. 491). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SOUTH: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1365. A bill for the relief of E. G. Briseno; with amendment (Rept. No. 492). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GWYNNE: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1485. A bill to pay to the Printz-Biederman Co., of Cleveland, Ohio, the sum of \$741.40, money paid as duty on merchandise imported under section 308 of the tariff act; without amendment (Rept. No. 493). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CARLSON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 1541. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Jotter; with amendment (Rept. No. 494). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. STACK: Committee on Claims. H. R. 2674. A bill for the relief of G. Elias & Bro., Inc.; with amendment (Rept. No. 495). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. TOLAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3107. A bill for the relief of William Louis Pitthan; with amendment (Rept. No. 496). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. RYAN: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3218. A bill for the relief of Fred Herrick; with amendment (Rept. No. 497). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3230. A bill for the relief of Rufus Hunter Blackwell, Jr.; with amendment (Rept. No. 498). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KENNEDY of Maryland: Committee on Claims. H. R. 3826. A bill for the relief of John Evans; with amendment (Rept. No. 499). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SMITH of Washington: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4428. A bill for the relief of Caroline (Stever) Dykstra; with amendment (Rept. No. 500). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4567. A bill for the relief of Robert E. Callen; with amendment (Rept. No. 501). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HOUSTON: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4651. A bill for the relief of the Noble County (Ohio) Agricultural Society; with amendment (Rept. No. 502). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DALY: Committee on Claims. H. R. 4942. A bill for the relief of Patrick Henry Walsh; without amendment (Rept. No. 503). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. EKWALL: Committee on Claims. H. R. 5041. A bill authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to reimburse Lela C. Brady and Ira P. Brady for the losses sustained by them by reason of the negligence of an employee of the Civilian Conservation Corps; with amendment (Rept. No. 504). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. LUCAS: Committee on Claims. S. 931. An act for the relief of the Concrete Engineering Co.; without amendment (Rept. No. 505). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. NICHOLS: Committee on Claims. S. 1012. An act for the relief of Ed Symes and wife, Elizabeth Symes, and certain other citizens of the State of Texas; with amendment (Rept. No. 506). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6968) to place George K. Shuler on the retired list of the United States Marine Corps; Committee on Military Affairs discharged, and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

A bill (H. R. 6297) for the relief of Leon Frederick Ruggles; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

A bill (H. R. 3710) for the relief of the heirs at law of Barnabas W. Baker and Joseph Baker; Committee on Claims discharged, and referred to the Committee on War Claims.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ELLENBOGEN: A bill (H. R. 7017) to regulate the use of the mails of the United States of America; prohibiting the use of the mails to all matter pertaining or concerning articles or commodities produced, manufactured, sold, or delivered by child labor; and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. JONES: A bill (H. R. 7018) to create the Farmers' Home Corporation, to promote more secure occupancy of farms and farm homes, to correct the economic instability resulting from some present forms of farm tenancy, to engage in rural rehabilitation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KNUTSON: A bill (H. R. 7019) to repeal the excise tax on manufactures of furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LANHAM (by request): A bill (H. R. 7020) providing for the purchase of certain inventions, designs, and methods of aircraft, aircraft parts, and aeronautical and aviation technique of Edwin Fairfax Naulty and Leslie Fairfax Naulty, of New York; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. PLUMLEY: A bill (H. R. 7021) to amend paragraph 1798 of the Tariff Act of 1930; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILCOX: A bill (H. R. 7022) to authorize the selection, construction, installation, and modification of permanent stations and depots for the Army Air Corps, and frontier air defense bases generally; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Virginia: A bill (H. R. 7023) to establish a commercial airport for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DEMPSEY: A bill (H. R. 7024) to authorize the conveyance by the United States to the municipality of Hot Springs, N. Mex., the NE $\frac{1}{2}$ of the SE $\frac{1}{4}$ and the NE $\frac{1}{4}$ of the SW $\frac{1}{4}$ sec. 6, T. 14 S., R. 4 W., Hot Springs, N. Mex.; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KOCIALKOWSKI: A bill (H. R. 7025) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to furnish transportation to persons in the service of the United States in the Virgin Islands, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HAMLIN: A bill (H. R. 7040) to promote safety of life and property at sea and to aid in preventing marine disasters; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, regarding the importation of wheat and corn; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, regarding a protective tariff on barley and barley malt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Iowa, supporting payment of the bonus; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, regarding tariffs to protect agriculture; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Oregon, supporting House bill 2024; to the Committee on War Claims.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Arizona, regarding antireligious outbreaks in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Utah, opposing House bill 3263; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Michigan, regarding the construction of a drainage canal to relieve the Sebawaing River Basin; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, regarding a processing tax on livestock; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of Nebraska, regarding the use of ethyl alcohol in gasoline; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, regarding the deportation of aliens on public relief; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, memorial of the Legislature of the State of California, regarding the deportation of undesirable aliens and aliens who are illegally in the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEITER: A bill (H. R. 7026) to correct the military record of Nicholas Lauber; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. BLOOM: A bill (H. R. 7027) for the relief of Mary Rita Parker; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 7028) for the relief of Okaloosa County, Fla.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COLE of Maryland: A bill (H. R. 7029) for the relief of Mamie E. Schaumburg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DELANEY: A bill (H. R. 7030) to place George K. Shuler on the retired list of the United States Marine Corps; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. DIRKSEN: A bill (H. R. 7031) for the relief of Capt. Karl Minnigerode; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRISCOLL: A bill (H. R. 7032) granting an increase of pension to Elizabeth W. Barringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 7033) for the relief of Capt. Roger H. Young; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOBBS: A bill (H. R. 7034) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. Edward J. Pruett; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LEA of California: A bill (H. R. 7035) for the relief of Charles Batini; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROBSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 7036) granting a pension to John C. Camden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 7037) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of the heirs of James Taylor, deceased Cherokee Indian, for the value of certain lands now held by the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WARREN: A bill (H. R. 7038) granting a pension to Susie A. Harmon; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WEST: A bill (H. R. 7039) for the relief of T. T. East and the Cassidy Southwestern Commission Co., citizens of the State of Texas; to the Committee on Claims.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5589. By Mr. BEITER: Petition of the National Association Opposed to Blue Laws, urging passage of House bill 5850, entitled "A bill to amend an act entitled 'An act to control the manufacture, transportation, possession, and sale of alcoholic beverages in the District of Columbia'"; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5590. By Mr. BLAND: Petition of six citizens of Westmoreland County, favoring a uniform Federal old-age-pension law that must be adopted by the States before any Federal aid or relief is available; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5591. By Mr. BOLTON: Petition signed by members of the Roosevelt Parent-Teacher Association of Willoughby Township, Lake County, Ohio, endorsing the Townsend old-age revolving pension bill (H. R. 3977); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5592. By Mr. DELANEY: Petition of the Old Glory Club of Flatbush, Inc., of Brooklyn, N. Y., favoring House Concurrent Resolution No. 2, withdrawing our recognition of Soviet Russia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5593. By Mr. HART: Memorial of the Common Council of the Borough of Sayreville and the State of New Jersey in session assembled, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass, and the President of the United States to approve, if passed, the General Pulaski's Memorial Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5594. By Mr. HULL: Memorial of the Wisconsin Legislature, relating to a protective tariff on barley and barley malt; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5595. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of Elmer Bullock, Sam Piccolo, Roy Foster, and Sam Scarmardo, of Bryan, Tex., favoring Federal regulation of motor vehicles; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5596. Also, petition of John D. Rogers and others, of Navasota, Tex., endorsing House bill 6198; to the Committee on Flood Control.

5597. By Mr. KENNEY: Resolution of the delegates of the Veterans Alliance of Essex County, requesting Congress to enact a law classifying all marines, soldiers, and sailors who served in any expedition on foreign shores where their lives were in danger as veterans; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

5598. Also, resolution of the New Jersey Society Sons of the Revolution of Titusville, N. J., approving the creation of a Bureau of Alien Deportation in the Department of Justice as provided for in House Joint Resolution No. 69 of the Seventy-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5599. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution of the Ancient Order of Hibernians, Division No. 1, Los Angeles, Calif., relative to the religious situation in Mexico, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5600. Also, resolution of the Council of the City of Los Angeles, at its meeting held on March 21, 1935, relative to the enactment of the Black bill, S. 1518, which provides for the establishment of a 6-hour day for carriers engaged in interstate and foreign commerce, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5601. By Mr. LUCAS: Resolution of the Greene County Association of Rural Mail Carriers of Greene County, Ill., relative to the improvement of mail route roads; to the Committee on Roads.

5602. Also, petition of the members of Farm Bureau and farmers of Scott County, Ill., relative to farm credit relief; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5603. By Mr. LUDLOW: Petition of the voters of Indianapolis, Ind., favoring the passage, without amendment, of House bill 7598, the so-called "workers unemployment and social-insurance bill"; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5604. By Mr. McLAUGHLIN: Petition requesting the Congress of the United States to promote, initiate, and support any legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuels to contain ethyl alcohol in a volume of not less than 10 percent of the mixture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5605. Also, petition memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact no livestock processing taxes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5606. By Mr. MERRITT of Connecticut: Petition of sundry citizens of Rowayton and West Redding in the State of Connecticut, protesting against the passage of the public-

utility bills (H. R. 5423 and S. 1725); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5607. By Mr. MITCHELL of Tennessee: Petition of the Tennessee Legislature, petitioning the President and the directors of the Tennessee Valley Authority to give early and favorable consideration to plans for commencing construction work on the Whites Creek, Chickamauga, and Hiwassee Dams during the year 1935; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

5608. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of Kenneth W. Sollitt and nine others of Bristol, Vt., protesting against the passage of either House bill 5423 or Senate bill 1725; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5609. By Mr. PFELFER: Petition of the Association of Employees, Long Lines Department, American Telephone & Telegraph Co., New York, concerning the national labor relations bill; to the Committee on Labor.

5610. Also, petition of the Coat and Suit Authority, New York City, regarding the extension of the National Recovery Administration for a period of 2 years as recommended by the President; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5611. Also, petition of Joseph W. Justus, 109 Java Street, Brooklyn, N. Y., and nine other citizens of New York, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5612. By Mr. PLUMLEY: Petition of F. V. Winslow and seven others of Montpelier, Vt., opposing the Wheeler public-utility bill (S. 1725) and the Rayburn public-utility bill (H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5613. Also, vote of the Vermont Baptist State Convention, at Ludlow, Vt., on March 22, 1935, representing some 10,000 members, protesting against enactment of the Wheeler or Rayburn bills; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5614. Also, petition of citizens of Berlin, Vt., opposing the Rayburn public-utility bill (H. R. 5423); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5615. By Mr. RUDD: Petition of Charles Adolph Wolff, 8633 One Hundred and Ninth Street, Richmond Hill, Long Island, N. Y., and four other citizens, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility holding companies bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5616. Also, petition of Francis McKeever, 9705 One Hundred and Eighth Street, Ozone Park, Long Island, N. Y., and 11 other citizens of Ozone Park, concerning the Rayburn-Wheeler public-utility holding companies bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5617. By Mr. STEFAN: Resolution adopted by the Nebraska House of Representatives, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact no livestock processing taxes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5618. Also, resolution adopted by the Nebraska State Senate, asking the Congress of the United States to promote, initiate, and support any legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuels to contain ethyl alcohol in a volume of not less than 10 percent of the mixture; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5619. By Mr. SUTPHIN: Petition of the New Jersey Brick Manufacturers Association; to the Committee on Appropriations.

5620. Also, petition of the Sons of the Revolution, New Jersey society; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5621. Also, petition of the mayor and Council of Sayreville, N. J.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5622. By Mr. TRUAX: Petition of members of the Roosevelt Parent-Teacher Association, Willoughby Township, Lake County, Ohio, heartily endorsing the Townsend old-age revolving pension bill and asking support of same; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5623. Also, petition of F. Davenport and numerous citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging support of Townsend recovery plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5624. Also, petition of Evelyn Hoffman and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they will be seriously harmed

if either of the public-utility bills (H. R. 5423 or S. 1725) becomes a law as they are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5625. Also, petition of Paul Hewetson and other citizens of Columbus, Ohio, stating that they would be seriously harmed if the public-utility bills were passed as they are unfair, unwise, unnecessary, and discriminatory; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

5626. Also, petition of Henry T. Fournies and other citizens of Toledo, Ohio, urging support of the Townsend plan; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5627. By Mr. WOLCOTT: Petition of Don R. Carrigan, Exalted Ruler, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, No. 343, Port Huron Lodge, Port Huron, Mich., and 144 others, requesting the Congress to empower the Department of Justice to investigate all subversive activities of individuals and organizations, alien or otherwise, seeking or planning the overthrow of our Government by force or other unlawful means, and for the enactment of legislation prohibiting the promotion or encouragement of the overthrow of a democratic form of government by force or violence, and other legislation to effectuate the purpose of the petitions; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5628. Also, petition of Ferd J. Miller, of Unionville, Mich., and 54 other members of Sebewaing Local, Farmers' Educational and Cooperative Union of America, urging the prompt enactment of the Frazier-Lemke refinancing bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

5629. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Mothers and Daughters' Study Club of Denver, Colo.; to the Committee on Labor.

5630. Also, petition of the Effingham Lodge, No. 1016, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5631. Also, petition of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5632. Also, petition of the town of East Providence, R. I.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5633. Also, petition of the city of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5634. Also, petition of the city of Norway, Mich.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5635. Also, petition of the Alteration Painters, Decorators, and Paperhangers Union of Greater New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5636. Also, petition of the Tierra Alta Chapter, D. A. R., Los Angeles, Calif.; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

5637. Also, petition of the National Association of Merchant Tailors; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5638. Also, petition of the city of Buffalo, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5639. Also, petition of the Townsend Club, No. 3, of San Diego, Calif.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5640. Also, petition by the Citizens Joint Committee on Fiscal Relations between the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

5641. Also, petition of citizens of Missouri, Montana, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New Mexico, New York, North Carolina, and North Dakota, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5642. Also, petition of citizens of Alabama, Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, Canal Zone, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Hawaii, Idaho, and Illinois, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5643. Also, petition of citizens of the States of Vermont, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Tennessee, Texas, and Utah, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5644. Also, petition of citizens of the States of Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

5645. Also, petition of citizens of the State of California, presented by the Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks of the United States of America, requesting the immediate passage of legislation designed to halt the activities of individuals and organizations within the United States seeking to overthrow the Government by force and violence; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, MARCH 27, 1935

(Legislative day of Wednesday, Mar. 13, 1935)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. ROBINSON, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Tuesday, March 26, 1935, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Hattigan, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 174) to permit articles imported from foreign countries for the purpose of exhibition at the California-Pacific International Exposition, San Diego, Calif., to be admitted without payment of tariff, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 935) to authorize the Secretary of War and the Secretary of the Navy to lend Army and Navy equipment for use at the national jamboree of the Boy Scouts of America.

ORDER FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CALENDAR

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President, I desire to submit a request for unanimous consent, and ask the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. McNARY]. I ask unanimous consent that when the unfinished business shall have been completed, the Senate shall proceed to the consideration of unobjected bills on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, I am quite in accord with the request, and, therefore, of course, have no objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. ROBINSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bulkeley	Couzens	Gore
Ashurst	Bulow	Cutting	Guffey
Austin	Burke	Dickinson	Hale
Bachman	Byrd	Donahay	Harrison
Bankhead	Byrnes	Duffy	Hatch
Barbour	Capper	Fletcher	Hayden
Barkley	Clark	Frazier	King
Bilbo	Connally	George	La Follette
Black	Coolidge	Gerry	Logan
Bone	Copeland	Gibson	Loneragan
Borah	Costigan	Glass	Long

McAdoo	Murray	Robinson	Trammell
McCarran	Neely	Russell	Truman
McGill	Norbeck	Schwellenbach	Tydings
McKellar	Norris	Sheppard	Vandenberg
McNary	Nye	Shipstead	Van Nuys
Maloney	O'Mahoney	Smith	Wagner
Metcalf	Pittman	Steinwer	Walsh
Minton	Pope	Thomas, Okla.	Wheeler
Moore	Radcliffe	Thomas, Utah	White
Murphy	Reynolds	Townsend	

Mr. ROBINSON. I announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Arkansas [Mrs. CARAWAY] and the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. OVERTON] are absent because of illness, and that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BROWN], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIETERICH], and the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] are necessarily detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement stand for the day.

Mr. McNARY. I wish to announce that the senior Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is absent on account of illness.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DAVIS] is absent on account of illness, that the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. CAREY] is absent on official business, that the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. SCHALL] is absent because of a death in his family, and that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] and the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. KEYES] are necessarily detained from the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-three Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the Senate by Mr. Latta, one of his secretaries.

FIVE HUNDREDTH ANNIVERSARY OF THE SWEDISH RIKSDAG

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Secretary of State, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, March 26, 1935.

The Vice President,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR MR. VICE PRESIDENT: A dispatch has been received from the Honorable Laurence A. Steinhardt, American Minister to Sweden, reporting that this year marks the five hundredth anniversary of the Swedish Riksdag, and that a celebration, including elaborate ceremonies, to mark this event will be held from May 27 to May 30 of this year.

This information is being sent to you as of possible interest to the Congress and for whatever action, if any, may be deemed advisable in the circumstances.

Very sincerely yours,

CORDELL HULL.

DISPOSITION OF USELESS PAPERS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Interior, transmitting, pursuant to law, lists of publications and documents on the files of the Department which are not needed in the conduct of business, and asking for action looking to their disposition, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Useless Papers in the Executive Departments.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. WAGNER and Mr. NORBECK members of the committee on the part of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the House of Representatives of the State of Nebraska, memorializing Congress not to impose any additional livestock processing taxes, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

(See resolution printed in full when presented by Mr. NORRIS on the 26th instant, p. 4417, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.)

The VICE PRESIDENT also laid before the Senate a resolution of the Senate of the State of Nebraska, favoring the enactment of legislation for the purpose of requiring all motor-vehicle fuel to contain ethyl alcohol in a volume of